AN

EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF

Oxford

AN

EXPOSITION OF THE CREED

BY JOHN PEARSON, D.D.

Lord Bishop of Chester

REVISED AND CORRECTED

BY THE REV. E. BURTON, D. D.

Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church

FIFTH EDITION

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

MDCCCLXIV

I love my books at times.
to lend
To those who fain would wisely
use them
But might I limit my borrowing
friend
I do not wish at all to
lose them

OXFORD:
BY T. COMBE, M.A., E. PICKARD HALL, AND H. LATHAM, M.A.
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

ADVERTISEMENT.

FOR this edition the book has been revised throughout, the quotations in the notes, with very few exceptions, verified and corrected, and the references, where necessary, completed. The quotations from the Hebrew, and from Rabbinical authors, have been revised by the Rev. R. Payne Smith, of the Bodleian Library, who has in some cases added such notes as seemed necessary to explain the reference. To these notes the initials R. P. S. are appended. In the Index of Authors the editions to which particular reference is made are specified. The pages of the folio edition of 1723 have been added in the margin.

OXFORD, *August*, 1864.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositionofcree0000john_u8i7

PREFACE OF THE EDITOR.

THE first edition of the Exposition of the Creed was printed at London in 1659, in a small quarto volume. The second, third, and fourth editions, were printed respectively in 1662, 1669, and 1676, in folio. I have seen notice of another edition published in 1678, but am uncertain whether it was a new edition, or merely the fourth edition with a new title page. I have seen a copy of an edition published in 1683, in folio, which is called the fifth: and it is certainly a different edition from the fourth of 1676. Notice may also be found of editions printed in 1684 and 1689: but they were probably copies of the fifth edition with new title pages; for another of 1692 is called the sixth edition. The dates of the five first editions may therefore be stated as follows:

First edition	1659.
Second	1662.
Third	1669.
Fourth	1676.
Fifth	1683.

It is important that this point should be settled, because Bishop Pearson died in 1686, and the last edition which was published in his lifetime must therefore be considered the standard, as having received the latest corrections of the author: and whoever will compare the first edition of 1659 with any of the four subsequent editions, will find that the work was very materially altered, particularly in the notes. The second edition of 1662 is said in the title page to be "revised and enlarged:" the third of 1669 to be "revised and now more enlarged:" and these latter words are repeated in each of the fourth and fifth editions. Thus far the statement was probably true: but I

have also seen the same words in the title page of the sixth edition (1692): and the ninth (1710) and tenth (1715) editions are said to be "revised and corrected:" but if any additions or corrections were really made in the three last instances, they diminished rather than increased the value of the work, since they were made after the author's death, and by persons concerning whom we know nothing. It is most probable, that the booksellers made a practice of repeating these words in every edition, though (with the exception of an index) the work was never enlarged after the year 1683.

The demand for this admirable work appears to have gone on steadily during the former half of the eighteenth century, and the twelfth edition was printed in 1741. Since that time I have not met with the notice of any edition having been printed in folio: and the next appears to have been that published at Oxford in 1797, in two volumes octavo. This was subsequently reprinted in 1816 and 1820: and in these three last editions, the notes, which had before accompanied the text, were thrown into a separate volume.

The plan pursued for settling the text of the present edition was as follows. A copy of the last Oxford reprint (1820) was collated throughout with a copy of the first edition (1659). Wherever they were found to differ, the fifth edition (1683) was also consulted: and when the alteration appeared to have been made advisedly by the author, the text of the fifth edition was preserved. In the great majority of cases there could be no doubt that the author himself had altered what had first been printed: but there were also many cases, in which it was demonstrable, by a comparison of the first and fifth editions, that the modern reprints are incorrect. We need not be surprised at this, when we consider the number of times that the work has passed through the press. There would be no exaggeration in saying, that editors or printers had introduced corruptions by altering the author's words in several hundred instances. Bishop Pearson's style is rugged and antiquated, even for the age in which he lived: and though his expressions have sometimes been altered for the better, it is plain that in many places his meaning was misunderstood, and his original language has been changed unnecessarily, if not improperly. The truth of this remark can only be ascertained by a laborious collation, such as has been made for the present edition; and though the reader may not

be aware of any remarkable differences between this and the former editions, the editor has the satisfaction of thinking, that the work has never yet been printed with such strict attention to the actual expressions of the author.

In passages where the meaning has been obscured by the intricacy of the style, and where different editors have taken the words in different senses, some assistance has been obtained by reference to a Latin translation of the work, made by Sim. J. Arnold, and printed at Frankfort on the Oder (Francofurti ad Viadrum) in 1691. This translation was made from the fifth edition: and Bishop Pearson's style is so full of Latinisms, that even the English reader will sometimes find the sentences more intelligible in the Latin than in their original language.

When this collation of the text was finished, another examination was made into the passages quoted from various authors. The reader of the Exposition is aware, that the chief value of the Notes consists in the copious references to the Fathers and other ancient writers. Bishop Pearson was familiar with these works to a degree which is almost incredible in the present age, when learning of this kind is generally picked up at second hand. It is plain that he consulted the original authors: and his accuracy will be complained of only by persons who have little experience in transcribing passages for the press. A work which contains many thousand quotations must necessarily contain several errors: and the editor is content to state, that the number of these errors has now been greatly diminished. It would be ostentatious, and certainly not true, to say that *in every instance* the original passages have been consulted. In many cases, where the quotation is short, and the name of the author alone is given, it would be endless, and almost needless, to search for the passage out of a whole volume, or perhaps out of many volumes. As it is, the verification has perhaps been carried to an unnecessary length: but the editor did not feel satisfied without comparing all the most important quotations with the best and latest editions. Wherever the author had evidently made an error of transcription, it has been corrected in the present edition; and where the collation of better MSS. or improved editorial skill has removed the faulty readings which Bishop Pearson found in his editions, the text of the quotation has been altered accordingly. The Bishop did not always refer to the subdivisions of works: but that the reader

may be able, if he should have the inclination, to consult the original passages, references have now been given to the book and chapter or section, and generally to the page, of the best and most recent editions. These references, which are enclosed in brackets, may be considered as blemishes in the typographical appearance of the book: but since they only occur in one volume, which consists wholly of notes*, it is hoped that this defect will be counterbalanced by the advantage of the references themselves. Great pains have been taken to make them accurate: and if the contrary should sometimes be the case, the reader is requested to remember, that the number of passages to be verified may be calculated by hundreds, if not by thousands. It might be expected, that the quotations from the Hebrew had become incorrect after passing through the hands of so many printers; and these have been carefully revised for the present edition.

It will be seen that some notes have been added. Whatever is introduced of this kind, will be readily distinguished from the author's own words, by being enclosed in brackets. The *indices* have also been considerably enlarged: and, independently of the advantage which every work derives from having a good index, the editor felt himself at liberty to do what he pleased in this department, since none of the editions published in the author's lifetime contained any index at all. These very useful appendages were added in some of the subsequent editions. The earliest which I have seen is that of 1710, in which there is an "index of texts and material heads." Later editions have added an index of authors quoted in the notes: and if the reader will refer to any of the former *indices*, he will find that all the three have been considerably enlarged.

M.DCCC.XXXIII.

* [i. e. in the edition of 1833. In the present edition it has been found convenient to include the whole in one volume.]

TO THE

RIGHT WORSHIPFUL AND WELL-BELOVED

THE PARISHIONERS OF ST. CLEMENT'S, EASTCHEAP.

Mercy unto you, and peace and love be multiplied.

IF I should be at any time unmindful of your commands, you might well esteem me unworthy of your continued favours; and there is some reason to suspect I have incurred the interpretation of forgetfulness, having been so backward in the performance of my promises. Some years have passed since I preached unto you upon such texts of Scripture as were on purpose selected in relation to the CREED, and was moved by you to make those meditations public. But you were pleased then to grant what my inclinations rather led me to, that they might be turned into an Exposition of the Creed itself; which, partly by the difficulty of the work undertaken, partly by the intervention of some other employments, hath taken me up thus long, for which I desire your pardon. And yet an happy excuse may be pleaded for my delay, meeting with a very great felicity, that as faith triumpheth in good works, so my Exposition of the Creed should be contemporary with the reedifying of your Church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my book should last so long as that fabric; yet I am exceedingly pleased that they should begin together; that the publishing of the one should so agree with the opening of the other. This, I hope, may persuade you to forget my slackness, considering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells you the excuse of church-work will be accepted in building, I beseech you let it not be denied in printing.

That blessed Saint, by whose name your parish is known, was a fellow-labourer with St. Paul, and a successor of St. Peter; he had the honour to be numbered in the Scripture with them *whose names are written in the book of life;* and when he had sealed the Gospel with blood*, he was one of the first whose memory was perpetuated by the building a Church to bear his name. Thus was St. Clement's Church famous in Rome, when Rome was famous for the *faith spoken of throughout the whole world.* He wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians

* [The martyrdom of Clement is extremely doubtful, and the evidence is rather against it.]

infested with a schism, in imitation of St. Paul, which obtained so great authority in the primitive times, that it was frequently read in their public congregations; and yet had for many hundred years been lost, till it was at last set forth out of the library of the late King.

Now as, by the providence of God, the memory of that primitive Saint hath been restored in our age, so my design aimeth at nothing else but that the primitive Faith may be revived. And therefore in this edition of the Creed I shall speak to you but what St. Jude hath already spoken to the whole Church, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.* If it were so needful for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the first faith, it will appear as needful for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earnestness, because the reason which he renders, as the cause of that necessity, is now more prevalent than it was at that time, or ever since. *For,* saith he, *there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.* The principles of Christianity are now as freely questioned as the most doubtful and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as safely denied, as the most unnecessary superstructions; that religion hath the greatest advantage which appeareth in the newest dress, as if we looked for another *faith to be delivered to the saints:* whereas in Christianity there can be no concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new, is certainly false. Look then for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace the first faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide than the Creed, received in all ages of the Church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while *those which are unskilful and unstable, wrest* the words of God himself *unto their own damnation,* ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulness, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability; which as it hath been the constant endeavour, so shall it ever be the prayer of him, who after so many encouragements of his labours amongst you, doth still desire to be known as

Your most faithful

Servant in the Lord,

JOHN PEARSON.

TO THE READER.

I HAVE in this book undertaken an Exposition of the Creed, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief account of the work, lest any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed, without controversy, is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian faith, and is generally taken to contain all things necessary to be believed. Now whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not an Expositor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to inquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equal and absolute necessity, we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient, as to the design of an Exposition, to interpret the words, and so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth, how far, and in what degree, and to what purposes, it is necessary.

This therefore is the method which I proposed to myself, and have prosecuted in every Article. First, to settle the words of each Article, according to their antiquity and generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the terms, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same. Thirdly, to shew what are those truths which are naturally contained in those terms so explicated, and to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly, to declare what is the necessity of believing those truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul, and upon the life of a believer. Lastly, by a recollection of all, briefly to deliver the sum of every particular truth, so that every one, when he pronounceth the Creed, may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to profess, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the whole, according to this method, I have considered, that a work of so general a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of readers, which though they may agree in judgment, yet must differ much in their capacities. Some there are who understand the original languages of the holy Scripture, the discourses and tractates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and history of the Church of God, the constant profession of settled

truths, the rise and increase of schisms and heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and uncapable of such instructions; who understand the Scriptures as they are translated; who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence; who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith, with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto them out of the Word of God, and in the language which they know. When I make this difference, and distinction of readers, I do not intend thereby, that because one of these is learned, the other is ignorant; for he which hath no skill of the learned languages, may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of Christian religion, and the reason and efficacy of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my Exposition, so that the body of it containeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language; by which he which is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected only such notions as are common, easy, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most material conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprise the whole strength of the work, as far as it is possible, in the body of it. The other part I have placed in the margin, (but so as oftentimes it taketh up more room, and yet is never mingled or confounded with the rest,) in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed, as to them which have any knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages, of the writings of the ancient Fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the history of the Church; those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian Religion.

Now being the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a religion, and those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in natural theology, such as no man which worshippeth a God can deny; and therefore in the proof of these, I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the Atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a religion to be professed. As it is our religion, it is Christian and Catholic. As Christian, it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I shew out of the Law and the Prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the

Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that *faith which was once delivered to the saints*, and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the Word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason; not urging the authority of the Church which they reject, but only giving in the margin the sense of the primitive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.

In that part, which, after the demonstration of each truth, teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian, I have not thought fit to expatiate or enlarge myself, but only to mention such effects as flow naturally and immediately from the doctrine; especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and perspicuity. And indeed in the whole work, as I have laid the foundation upon the written word of God, so I have with much diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to each doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as they lie in the writings of those holy penmen; not referring the reader to places named in the margin, (which too often I find in many books multiplied to little purpose,) but producing and interweaving the sentences of Scripture into the body of my Exposition, so that the reader may understand the strength of all my reason, without any further inquiry or consultation. For if those words which I have produced prove not what I have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the places named to maintain it.

At the conclusion of every distinct and several notion, I have recollected briefly and plainly the sum of what hath been delivered in the explication of it, and put it, as it were, into the mouth of every Christian, thereby to express more fully his faith, and to declare his profession. So that if the reader please to put those collections together, he may at once see and perceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this public, ancient, and orthodox Confession of Faith.

I have nothing more to add; but only to pray, that the Lord would give you and me a good understanding in all things.

THE CREED.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord: Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary: suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried: He descended into Hell, the third day he rose again from the dead: He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead: I believe in the Holy Ghost: The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints: The Forgiveness of Sins: The Resurrection of the body: And the Life everlasting.

AN EXPOSITION

OF

THE CREED.

ARTICLE I.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

As the first word *Credo, I believe,* giveth a denomination to the whole Confession of Faith, from thence commonly called the *CREED;* so is the same word to be imagined not to stand only where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the Confession. For although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefixed to the head of every Article: that as we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty,* so we are also understood to say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord;* as, *I believe in the Holy Ghost,* so also, *I believe the Catholick Church.* Neither is it to be joined with every complete Article only; but where any Article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be looked upon as affixed to every part, or single truth contained in that Article: as for example, in the first, *I believe in God, I believe* that *God to be the Father, I believe* that *Father* to be *Almighty, I believe* that *Father Almighty* to be the *Maker of Heaven and Earth.* So that this *Credo, I believe,* rightly considered, multiplieth itself to no less than a double number of the Articles, and will be found at least twenty-four times contained in the *CREED.* Wherefore being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our Confession of Faith, that without it we can neither have *CREED* nor Confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many and so various truths.

Now by this previous expression, *I believe*, thus considered, every particular Christian is first taught, and then imagined, to make confession of his Faith: and consequently this word, so 2
used, admits a threefold consideration: first, as it supposeth Belief, or Faith, which is confessed: secondly, as it is a Confession, or external expression of that Faith so supposed: thirdly, as both the Faith and Confession are of necessary and particular obligation. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered, first, what is the true nature and notion of Belief; secondly, what the duty of confessing of our Faith; thirdly, what obligation lies upon every particular person to believe and confess; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the first word of the *CREED*, then may every one understand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe*.

For the right understanding of the true nature of Christian Faith, it will be no less than necessary to begin with the general notion of Belief; which being first truly stated and defined, then by degrees deduced into its several kinds, will at last make the nature of Christian Faith intelligible: a design, if I mistake not, not so ordinary and usual, as useful and necessary.

Belief in general I define to be an Assent to that which is credible, as credible. By the word *Assent*[1] is expressed that act or habit of the understanding, by which it receiveth, acknowledgeth and embraceth any thing as a truth; it being the nature[2] of the Soul so to embrace whatsoever appeareth true unto

1 Πίστις δέ—πρόληψις ἑκούσιός ἐστι, θεοσεβείας συγκατάθεσις. *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib* ii. [p. 432.] Πίστις μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ συγκατάθεσις ἀδιάκριτος τῶν ἀκουσθέντων ἐν πληροφορίᾳ τῆς ἀληθείας τῶν κηρυχθέντων Θεοῦ χάριτι. *S. Basil. Ascet. de Fide.* [vol. ii. p. 224 C.] The Basilidians, Ὁρίζονται γοῦν οἱ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου τὴν πίστιν ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσιν πρός τι τῶν μὴ κινούντων αἴσθησιν διὰ τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι. *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* ii. [p. 443.] Κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον, πίστις ἐστὶν ἑκούσιος τῆς ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσις. *Theodoret. Therap. Serm.* i. [vol. iv. p. 479 A.] And yet he also afterwards acknowledgeth they had that definition from the Greeks: Τὴν μὲν γὰρ πίστιν καὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι φιλόσοφοι ὡρίσαντο εἶναι ἑθελούσιον τῆς ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσιν. 'Credere—est cum assensu cogitare.' *August.* [De Prædestin. Sanct. c. ii. §. 5. vol. x. p. 792 E.] Et *de Sp. et Lit. lib.* 'Quid est credere, nisi consentire verum esse quod dicitur?' [c. 54. vol. x. p. 116 A.] So I take the *συγκατάθεσις* used by the Greek Fathers to signify *assensum* or *assensionem*, as A. Gellius translateth the Stoick, *συγκατατίθεται*, *sua assensione approbat. lib.* xix. 1. And before him Cicero, 'Nunc de assensione atque approbatione, quam Græci *συγκατάθεσιν* vocant, pauca dicemus.' [In Lucullo §. 37.] *Acad. Quæst.* iv. 12. So *ἀπιστία* and *συγκατάθεσις* are opposed by the Greeks. As Sextus Empiricus speaking of Admetus seeing Alcestis brought back by Hercules from Hades, Ἐπεὶ μέντοι ἤδει ὅτι τέθνηκε, περιεσπᾶτο αὐτοῦ ἡ διάνοια ἀπὸ τῆς συγκαταθέσεως, καὶ πρὸς ἀπιστίαν ἔκλινε. *Pyrrh. Hypot. lib.* i. 33.

2 Φιλαλήθης ἡ ψυχὴ οὐδέποτε κατὰ τὸ ψεῦδος ἀνεχομένη διατίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ

it, and so far as it so appeareth. Now this Assent or judgment of any thing to be true, being a general act of the understanding, and so applicable to[3] other habits thereof as well as to Faith, must be specified by its proper object, and so limited and determined to its proper act, which is the other part left to complete the definition.

This object of Faith is first expressed by *that which is credible;* for every one who believeth any thing, doth thereby without question assent unto it as to that which is credible; and therefore all belief whatsoever is such a kind of Assent. But though all belief be an Assent to that which is credible, yet every such Assent may not be properly Faith; and therefore those words make not the definition complete. For he which sees an action done, knows it to be done, and therefore assents unto the truth of the performance of it because he sees it: but another person to whom he relates it, may assent unto the performance of the same action, not because himself sees it, but because the other relates it; in which case *that which is credible* is the object of Faith in one, of evident knowledge in the other. To make the definition therefore full, besides the material object or thing believed, we have added the formal object, or that whereby it is properly believed, expressed in the last term, *as credible,* which being taken in, it then appears, that, first, whosoever believeth any thing, assenteth to something which is to him credible, and that as it is credible; and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible, as it is credible, believeth something by so assenting: which is sufficient to shew the definition complete.

3 But for the explication of the same, further observations will be necessary. For if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the credibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be credible,

φανὲν ἀληθὲς πάντως καὶ εὐθύς. Simplic. in 3. Aristot. de Anima. [p. 59.] Κἄν τις τἀληθὲς σκοπῇ, εὑρήσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον φύσει διαβεβλημένον μὲν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ψεύδους συγκατάθεσιν, ἔχοντα δὲ ἀφορμὰς πρὸς πίστιν τἀληθοῦς. *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* ii. [c. 12. p. 458.]

[3] As *συγκατάθεσις,* the Greek word used for this assent, is applied to other acts of the understanding as well as that of belief, so Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of the definition of faith, Ἄλλοι δ' ἀφανοῦς πράγματος ἐνωτικὴν συγκατάθεσιν ἀπέδωκαν εἶναι τὴν πίστιν, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, ἀγνοουμένου πράγματος φανερὰν συγκατάθεσιν. *Strom. lib.* ii. [c. 2. p. 433.] And again, Πᾶσα οὖν δόξα καὶ κρίσις καὶ ὑπόληψις καὶ μάθησις, οἷς ζῶμεν καὶ σύνεσμεν αἰεί, τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων, συγκατάθεσίς ἐστιν· ἡ δ' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πίστις εἴη ἄν· ἥ τε ἀπιστία, ἀποσύστασις οὖσα τῆς πίστεως, δυνατὴν δείκνυσι τὴν συγκατάθεσίν τε καὶ πίστιν. [p. 458.]

and in what credibility doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of Belief.

Now that is properly credible, which is not apparent of itself, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reversely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these ways, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves, are either so in respect of our sense, as that snow is white, and fire is hot; or in respect of our understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater than any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kind of which being propounded to our sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed credible, but evident to sense; as the latter kind, propounded to the understanding, are immediately embraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called credible, but evident to the understanding. And so those things which are apparent[4], are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

Again, other things, though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connection with something formerly known. For, being every natural cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own natural effect, and every natural effect wholly dependeth upon, and absolutely presupposeth its own proper cause; therefore there must be an immediate connection between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows, that, if the connection be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these ways, proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in mathematics, and conclusions in other sciences: which propositions and conclusions are not said to be credible, but scientifical; and the comprehension of them is not Faith, but Science.

Besides, some things there are, which, though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessary connection to their causes or effects, notwithstanding appear to most as true by some ex-

4 'Apparentia non habent fidem, sed agnitionem.' *Greg.* 4. *Dial. cap.* 5. [see Hom. xxvi In Evang. vol.i. p.1557 A.] 'Habet Fides oculos suos, quibus quodammodo videt verum esse quod nondum videt, et quibus certissime videt, nondum se videre quod credit.' *S. August. Epist.* 222. [Epist. 120. §. 8. vol. ii. p. 349 F.]

ternal relations to other truths; but yet so, as the appearing truth still leaves a possibility of falsehood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an Assent. In which case, whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon real arguments, is not yet called credible, but probable; and an Assent to such a truth is not properly Faith, but Opinion.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding, in and of itself, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connection with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any real arguments, or reference to other acknowledged truths, and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of itself, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said[5] properly to be credible; and an Assent unto this, upon such credibility, is in the proper notion Faith or Belief.

Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of Faith in general, so far as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever; our method will lead us on to descend, by way of division, to the several kinds thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of Faith in the Christian's Confession, the design of our present
4 disquisition; and being we have placed the formality of the object of all belief in credibility, it will clearly follow, that a diversity of credibility in the object will proportionably cause a distinction of assent in the understanding, and consequently a several kind of Faith, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an assent.

Now the credibility of objects, by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different authority of the testimony on which it depends. For we having no other certain means of assuring ourselves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our assent in matters of mere belief, than the testimony upon which we believe; if there be any fundamental distinction in the authority of the testimony, it will cause the like difference in the assent, which must needs bear a proportion to the authority of the testimony, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider, in what the authority of a testimony consisteth, and so to

5 Αἱ διὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ῥᾴδιοι πίστεις. *Aristot. Probl.* xviii. 3. §. 2.

descend to the several kinds of testimonies founded upon several authorities.

The strength and validity of every testimony must bear proportion with the authority[6] of the Testifier: and the authority of the Testifier is founded upon his ability and integrity: his ability in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserteth; his integrity in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. For two several ways he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth, which in itself is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithful, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so, though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these ways, for want either of ability or integrity in the Testifier, whoso grounds his assent unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so able as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so faithful as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived, so deceiveth no man. So far therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, and to be faithful in the relation of what he knows, so far his testimony is acceptable, so far that which he testifieth is properly credible. And thus the authority of every Testifier or Relater is grounded upon these two foundations, his ability and integrity.

Now there is in this case, so far as it concerns our present design, a double[7] testimony: the testimony of man to man, relying upon human authority, and the testimony of God to man, founded upon divine authority: which two kinds of testimony are respective grounds of two kinds of credibility, Human and Divine; and consequently there is a twofold Faith distinguished by this double object, a Human and a Divine Faith.

6 Τῷ γὰρ ποιόν τινα φαίνεσθαι τὸν λέγοντα, πιστεύομεν· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν, ἂν ἀγαθὸς φαίνηται, ἢ εὔνους, ἢ ἄμφω. *Arist. Rhet. lib.* i. *cap.* 8. §. 6.

7 '*Fil.* Testimoniorum quæ sunt genera? *Pat.* Divinum et Humanum. Divinum, ut oracula, ut auspicia, ut vaticinationes, ut responsa sacerdotum, haruspicum, conjectorum: Humanum, quod spectatur ex auctoritate, et ex voluntate, et ex oratione aut libera aut expressa; in quo insunt scripta, pacta, promissa, jurata, quæsita.' *Cicero, Orat. Partit. cap.* 2. §. 6.

Human Faith is an Assent unto any thing credible merely upon the testimony of man. Such is the belief we have of the words and affections one of another. And upon this kind of Faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of our life; according to the opinion we have of the ability and fidelity of him which relates or asserts any thing we believe or disbelieve. By this a friend assureth himself of the affection of his friend: by this the son[8] acknowledgeth his father, and upon this is his obedience wrought. By virtue of this Human Faith it is that we doubt not at all of those things which we never saw, by reason of their distance from us, either by time or place. Who doubts whether there be such a country as Italy, or such a city as Constantinople, though he never passed any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there was such a man as Alexander in the east, or Cæsar in the west? and yet the latest of these hath been beyond the possibility of the knowledge of man these sixteen hundred years. There is no science taught without original belief, there are no letters[9] learnt without preceding faith. There is no justice executed, no commerce maintained, no business prosecuted without this; all secular affairs[10] are transacted, all great achievements are attempted, all hopes, desires, and inclinations are preserved by this Human Faith grounded upon the testimony of man.

In which case we all by easy experience may observe the nature, generation, and progress of Belief. For in any thing which belongeth to more than ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered: but if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth within the compass of his knowledge, that we readily assent unto; and while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this Assent is properly Belief.

8 'Nec dicant, Non credimus, quia non vidimus; quoniam si hoc dicant, coguntur fateri incertos sibi esse parentes suos.' *De fide rerum invisib.* amongst the works of St. Augustin. [§. 4. p. 143 E. vol. vi.]

Αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο·
'Αλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες, ἢ πιστεύομεν.

Menander apud Stob. [quoted from Eustathius in Hom. p. 1412.]

9 Ὑποβάθρα μέντοι καὶ κρηπὶς τῆς ἐπιστήμης ἡ πίστις. *Theodoret. Therap. Serm.* 1. [vol. iv. p. 481 C.] Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα μαθεῖν οἷόν τε μὴ τῷ γραμματιστῇ πεπιστευκότα. *Ibid.* [vol. iv. p. 479 B.]

10 Πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τελούμενα, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τῇ πίστει τελεῖται. *Cyril. Hier. Catech.* 5. [p. 73 A.] *Orig. cont Cels. lib.* i. [§. 11. p. 328.] *Euseb. de Præp. Evang. lib.* i. *cap.* 5. *Arnob. adv. Gent. lib.* ii. [p. 47.]

Whereas, if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the Relater which will satisfy us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity: but if we think him so just and honest, that he hath no design upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmations; and this Assent is our Belief. Seeing then our Belief relies upon the ability and integrity of the Relater, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitful, and so their integrity to be suspected, there can be no infallible universal ground of Human Faith.

But what satisfaction we cannot find in the testimony of Man, we may receive in the testimony of God[11]. *If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater. Yea, let God be true,* the ground of our Divine, *and every man a liar,* the ground of our Human Faith.

1 John v. 9.
Rom. iii. 4.

As for the other member of the division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined; Divine Faith is an Assent unto something as credible upon the testimony of God. This Assent is the highest kind of Faith, because the object hath the highest credibility, because grounded upon the testimony of God, which is infallible. Balaam could tell Balak thus much, *God is not a Man, that he should lie;* and a better Prophet confirmed the same truth to Saul, *The Strength of Israel will not lie;* and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of Israel, even *my God, my strength, in whom I will trust.*

Numb. xxiii. 19.
1 Sam. xv. 29.
Ps. xviii. 2.

For first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as Hannah hath taught us, *The Lord is a God of knowledge,* or rather, if our language will bear it, *of knowledges,* which are so plural, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the Psalmist hath said, *Of his understanding there is no number.* He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth, and essentially knowledge, and, as so, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of comprehension[12], and

1 Sam. ii. 3. אל דעות יהוה
LXX. Θεὸς γνώσεων Κύριος.
Ps. cxlvii. 5. In the Heb. לתבונתו אין מספר

11 'Quam indignum, ut humanis testimoniis de alio credamus, Dei oraculis de se non credamus!' *S. Ambros. lib.* i. *de Abraham, cap.* 3. [§. 21. vol. i. p. 289 C.] Πῶς δ' οὐκ εὐλογώτερον, πάντων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πίστεως ἠρτημένων, ἐκείνων μᾶλλον πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ; *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* i. [§. 11. vol. i. p. 329 C.]

12 'Cujus sapientia simpliciter multiplex, et uniformiter multiformis, in-

not so only, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known, we see them but as in a glass or through a cloud: but *God is light, and in him is no darkness at all:* he seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his understanding is most clear and evident; *neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his* 6 *sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.* Wherefore being all things are within the compass of his knowledge, being all things which are so are most clear and evident unto him, being the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceived in anything.

1 John. i. 5.

Heb. iv. 13.

Secondly, The justice of God is equal to his knowledge, nor is his holiness inferior to his wisdom: *A God of truth,* saith Moses, *and without iniquity, just and right is he.* From which internal, essential and infinite rectitude, goodness, and holiness, followeth an impossibility to declare or deliver that for truth which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be against that finite purity and integrity which is required of Man, to lie, and therefore sinful, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essential unto God. Although therefore the power of God be infinite, though he *can do all things;* yet we may safely say, without any[13] prejudice to his omnipotency, that he cannot[14] speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise. For the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding; neither can he be unholy or unjust more than he can be ignorant or unwise. *If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself.* Which words of the Apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions; neither should he more *deny himself* in violating his fidelity, than in contradicting his veracity. It is true, that *God willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was*

Deut. xxxii. 4.

2 Tim. ii. 13.

Heb. vi. 17, 18.

comprehensibili comprehensione omnia incomprehensibilia comprehendit.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xii. *cap.* 18. [p. 317 G. vol. vii.]

13 Δύναται δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς, ἅπερ δυνάμενος, τοῦ Θεὸς εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, καὶ σοφὸς εἶναι οὐκ ἐξίσταται. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* iii. [§. 70. vol. i. p. 493 F.]

14 'Si volunt invenire quod omnipotens non potest, habent prorsus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xxii. *cap.* 25. [p. 693 A. vol. vii.]

impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation: but it is as true, that all this confirmation is only for our consolation; otherwise it is as impossible for God to lie, without an
Heb. vi. 13. oath, as with one: for being he can *swear by no greater, he sweareth* only *by himself*, and so the strength even of the oath of God relieth upon the veracity of God. Wherefore being God, as God, is of infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, being it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man.

It is therefore most infallibly certain, that God being infinitely wise, cannot be deceived[15]; being infinitely good, cannot deceive[16]: and upon these two immovable pillars standeth the authority of the testimony of God. For since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one, but by questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the testimony. But where there is an intrinsical repugnancy[17] of being deceived in the understanding, and of deceiving in the will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it,
1 John v. 10. must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy: *He that believeth not God*, saith the Apostle, *hath made him a liar*. That truth then which is testified by God, hath a divine credibility: and an assent unto it as so credible, is Divine Faith. In which the material object is the doctrine which God delivereth, the formal object is that credibility founded on the authority[18] of the

15 'Cum sit omnipotens, mori non potest, falli non potest, mentiri non potest.' *August. de Symb. ad Catechum. lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [p. 547 C. vol. vi.]

16 'Deus facere fraudem nescit, pati non potest.' *Chrysol. Serm.* 62. [p. 707 B.]

17 'Auctoritas Dei consistit in intrinseca repugnantia deceptionis seu falsitatis quam habet divinum judicium, et in intrinseca repugnantia actus voluntatis imperantis testimonium extrinsecum non consentiens judicio interno; quæ per terminos positivos actus intellectus infallibiliter veri, et actus voluntatis intrinsece et necessario recti, poterit explicari.' *Francis. de Oviedo Tract. de Fide. Contr.* ii. *punc.* 2.

18 'Divina est auctoritas cui credimus; divina est doctrina quam sequimur.' *Leo, Serm.* 7. *in Nativ.* [vol. i. p. 165.]

deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of Divine Faith in general.

7 Now being the credibility of all which we believe is founded upon the testimony of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of Faith, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To which end it will be necessary to give notice that the testimony of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated; nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by Man, and then resolved and confirmed by interposing the authority of God: but he is then said to witness when he doth propound, and his testimony is given by way of Revelation, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of Faith itself, yet of the means and manner of Assent.

Wherefore it will be further necessary to observe, that Divine Revelation is of two kinds, either immediate or mediate. An immediate Revelation is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself, without the intervention of man. A mediate Revelation is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the Prophets; by the second in the Prophets, and by them unto us. Being then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the Prophets and to others, being the Faith both of Prophets, and others, relieth wholly upon Divine Revelation, the difference[19] of the manner of Assent in these several kinds of Believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our Faith.

Those then to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an Angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name (of which I shall need here to make no distinction), those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal him-

19 'Sicut duplex est auditus et locutio, scilicet exterior sive corporalis, et interior ac spiritualis; ita duplex est fides, una quæ oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditum exteriorem, cum scilicet Deus per aliquos homines aliis credenda proponit; et ista est fides quæ nobis sive communi statui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adhæremus revelationibus Prophetis et Apostolis factis: —alia est quæ oritur in aliquibus per spiritualem locutionem, qua Deus aliquibus per internam inspirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominis ministerio utens; sicut est fides Apostolorum et Prophetarum, qui ab ipso Deo per intrinsecam illuminationem sunt de credendis instructi.' *Francis. Ferrariensis in Thom. cont. Gent. lib.* iii. *cap.* 40.

self, did by virtue of the same revelation perceive, know, and assure themselves, that he which spake to them was God; so that at the same time they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that Abraham would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by an immediate revelation of his will clearly commanded it. Thus [a]*by faith Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house:* which warning[20] of God was a clear revelation of God's determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command for that end to build an ark. And this Noah so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the Author, as informed of the command. Thus the judgments hanging over Judah were revealed in the ears of Isaiah [b]*by the Lord of Hosts.* Thus [c]*the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh:* at first indeed he knew him not; that is, when the Lord spake, he knew it not to be the voice of God: [d]*Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him;* but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was he which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the [e]*ears* of Samuel were *revealed,* and the [f]word of God *revealed,* and [g]God himself *revealed* to him. By all which we can understand no less, than that Samuel was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God: so Samuel the Seer, so the rest of the Prophets believed those truths revealed to them by such a faith as was a firm assent unto an object credible upon the immediate testimony of God.

But those faithful people to whom the Prophets spake believed the same truth, and upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those Prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the Prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God *appeared* unto

[a] Heb. xi. 7.

[b] Isa. xxii. 14.

[c] 1 Sam. iii. 21.

[d] 1 Sam. iii. 7.

[e] 1 Sam. ix. 15. יהוה גלה אזן שמואל Κύριος ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ὠτίον Σαμουήλ.

[f] 1 Sam. iii. 7. טרם יגלה אליו דבר יהוה Πρὶν ἢ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτῷ ῥῆμα Κυρίου.

[g] 1 Sam. iii. 21. ויגל יהוה אל שמואל Ἀπεκαλύφθη Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουήλ.

Exod. iii. 2.

8

20 Πίστει χρηματισθείς, which word comes from the original χράω, appropriated by the Greeks to an oracle, or answer given by God: Ὁ μὲν Θεὸς χρῇ, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος μαντεύεται. *Moschop.* [Ecl. Attic. Dictionum. s. v. χράω.]

Moses *in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush,* and there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, *I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,* and then his will, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the revelation of himself and of his will, and was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding still he doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them, not immediately by God, but by Moses; *And Moses answered and said, But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee.* Which words of his first suppose, that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth upon a testimony divine; and then as rationally affirm, that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promised by Moses, only because Moses said so. Which rational objection was clearly taken away, when God endued Moses with power of evident and undoubted miracles; for then the rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites, that God had appeared unto him, as the flaming bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's omnipotency, could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity; insomuch as when Aaron became to Moses *instead of a mouth,* and Moses to Aaron *instead of God, Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed.* For being persuaded by a lively and active presence of omnipotency that God had appeared unto Moses, and what was delivered to them by him came to him from God; and being sufficiently assured out of the very sense and notion of a Deity, that whatsoever God should speak must of necessity be true, they presently assented, *and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses;* Moses, as the immediate pro-pounder; God, as the original revealer: they believed Moses that God had revealed it, and they believed the promise, because God had revealed it. So that the Faith both of Moses and the Israelites was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed only in the proposition or application of the

Exod. iv. 1.

Exod. iv. 16, 30, 31.

Exod. xiv. 31.

testimony; Moses receiving it immediately from God himself, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of Moses.

In the like manner the succeeding Prophets were the instruments of Divine Revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them, and then the people as revealed by them: for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God delivered by man. It was *he* who *spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets which have been since the world began:* the *mouth*, the instrument, the articulation was theirs; but the words were God's. *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me*, saith David, *and his word was in my tongue.* It was the word of the Lord, which he spake *by the hand of Moses*, and *by the hand of his servant Ahijah the Prophet.* The *hand*, the general instrument of man, the *mouth*, the particular instrument of speech, both attributed to the Prophets as merely instrumental in their prophecies. The words which Balaam's ass spake were as much the ass's words, as those which Balaam spake were his; for *the Lord opened the mouth of the ass*, and *the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth;* and not only so, but a bridle 9 with that word, *only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak.* The Prophets, as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct, or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and subsequent words interpret those words of St. Peter, that *no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation:* that is, that no Prophecy which is written did so proceed from the Prophet which spake or wrote it, that he of himself or by his own instinct did open his mouth to prophesy*; but that all prophetical revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, *for the Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* That therefore which they delivered was the Word, the Revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest of the Believers assented

Luke i. 70.

2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

1 Kings viii. 53. xiv. 18.

Numb. xxii. 28. xxiii. 5. xxii. 35.

2 Pet. i. 20. Ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως.

* [So Philo Judæus, προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἀποφθέγγεται, ἀλλότρια δὲ πάντα ὑπηχοῦντος ἑτέρου. Vol. I. p. 510.]

upon the same testimony of God mediately delivered by the hands of the Prophets.

Thus *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets,* and by so speaking propounded the object of Faith both to the Prophets and the Fathers, *hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,* and by so speaking hath enlarged the object of Faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the *Faith of Jesus.* Thus the *only begotten Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, the express Image of his Person,* he *in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell,* he *in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,* revealed the will of God to the Apostles, who being assured that he *knew all things,* and convinced that he came *forth from God,* gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their Faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. *I have given unto them,* saith Christ unto his Father, *the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.* Beside this delivery of these words by Christ to the Apostles, they received the promise of the *Spirit of Truth,* which should *guide them into all truth,* and *teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them.* So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnished with divine Illuminations and Revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own Faith; that each of them might well make that profession of St. Paul, *I know whom I have believed.* Thus the Faith of the Apostles, as of Moses and the Prophets, was grounded upon the immediate Revelations of God.

Heb. i. 1. Verse 2. Rev. xiv. 12. John i. 18. Heb i. 3. Col. i. 19. ii. 9. John xvi. 30. John xvii. 8. John xvi. 13. xiv. 26. 2 Tim. i. 12.

But those Believers to whom the Apostles preached, and whom they converted to the Faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the Apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the Apostles, that is, immediately from God. But, as the Israelites believed those truths which Moses spake to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the rod which he carried in his hand; so the blessed Apostles, being so plentifully endued from above with the power of miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard St. Peter call a

lame man unto his legs, speak a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did Ananias and Sapphira, might easily be persuaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his omnipotency, they might well expect him in his veracity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the Apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the Apostles they believed. *Neither pray I for these alone,* saith Christ, *but for them also who shall believe on me through their word.* Thus the Apostles believed on Christ through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same Christ through the Apostles' word, and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the Apostles was really distinct from the word of Christ, but only it was called theirs, because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed. *That which was from the beginning,* saith St. John, *which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life, that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.* And this was the true foundation of Faith, in all them which believed, that they took not the words which they heard from the Apostles to be the words of the men which spake them, no more than they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles, to be the power of them that wrought them; but as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When St. Paul preached at Antioch, *almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God;* so they esteemed it, though they knew him a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the Apostle commendeth in the Thessalonians, that *when* they *received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but* (*as it is in truth*) *the word of God;* and receiving it so, they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive or be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true; and by so embracing it, they assented unto it, by so assenting to it, they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of St. Paul, as he speaks himself, *because our testimony among you was believed.* Thus the Faith of those which were converted by the Apostles was an assent

John xvii. 20.

1 John i. 1, 3.

Acts xiii. 44.

1 Thess. ii. 13.

2 Thess. i. 10.

unto the word as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony Apostolical. Which being thus clearly stated, we may at last descend into our own condition, and so describe the nature of our own Faith, that every one may know what it is to believe.

Although Moses was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the mount, and spake with him face to face at the door of the Tabernacle; although upon these grounds the Israelites believed what he delivered to them as the word of God; yet neither the miracles nor Moses did for ever continue with them; and notwithstanding his death, they and their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore it is observable, which St. Stephen saith, *he received* Acts vii. 38. *the lively Oracles to give unto them;* the Decalogue he received from the hand of God, *written with the finger of God;* the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself, and so delivered them not a mortal word to die with him, but *living Oracles*, to Λόγια ζῶντα. be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief, when his rod had ceased to broach the rocks and divide the seas. Neither did he only tie them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but by foretelling and describing the Prophets which should be raised in future ages, he put a farther obligation upon them to believe their Prophecies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the Israelites, in all ages, believed Moses; while he lived, by believing his words; after his death, by believing his writings. *Had ye believed Moses*, saith our Saviour, *ye would* John v. 46, 47. *have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?* Wherefore the Faith of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was an assent unto the 11 truths of the Law as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered unto them in the writings of Moses and the Prophets.

In the like manner is it now with us. For although Christ first published the Gospel to those *who beheld his glory, the* John i. 14. *glory as of the only begotten of the Father;* although the Apostles first converted those unto the Faith, who heard them speak with tongues they never learned, they never heard before, and discover the thoughts of men they never saw before; who saw the lame to walk, the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command; yet did not these Apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortened them by their

constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine farther confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations long survive them; and yet they left as great an obligation upon the Church in all succeeding ages to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore require the same readiness of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While Moses lived and spake as a mediator between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the Prophets while they preached. When Moses was gone up to Mount Nebo, and there died, when the rest of the Prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their Faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he *made known unto* the Apostles, as his friends, *all things that he had heard of the Father*, then did the Apostles believe the writings of Moses and the Prophets, and the words of Christ, and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their Faith, *and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.* When Christ was ascended up into Heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when the words which Christ had taught the Apostles were preached by them, and many thousand souls converted to the Faith, they believed the writings of the Prophets and the words of the Apostles; and in these two was comprised the complete object of their Faith. When the Apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the Gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the sum of what they had received, in writing, for the continuation of the Faith in the Churches which they had planted, and the propagation thereof in other places, by those which succeeded them in their ordinary function, but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. *These things were written*, saith St. John, the longest liver, and the latest writer, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

John xv. 15.

John ii. 22.

John xx. 31.

Those Christians then which have lived since the Apostles' death, and never obtained the wish of St. Augustin, to see either Christ upon earth, or St. Paul in the pulpit, have believed the

writings of Moses and the Prophets, of the Apostles and Evangelists, in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine Faith; and so *the household of God is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*[21], who are continued unto us only in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he which put their writings into the definition of Faith, considering Faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the Schoolmen[22]. From whence we may at last conclude, that the true nature of the Faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's Church now stands, 12 and shall continue to the end of the World, consists in this, that it is an assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. Eph. ii. 20.

To *believe* therefore, as the word stands in the front of the *CREED*, and not only so, but is diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceived, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive) and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets immediately inspired, moved, and acted by God, out of whose writings this brief sum of necessary points of Faith was first[23] collected. And as this is properly to *believe*, which was our first consideration; so to say *I believe*, is to make a confession or external expression of the Faith, which is the second consideration propounded.

Faith is an habit of the intellectual part of Man, and therefore of itself invisible; and to believe is a spiritual act, and consequently immanent and internal, and known to no man but him who believeth: *For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?* Wherefore Christ being not only the great Apostle, sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the Author of our Faith, but also the Head of the 1 Cor. ii. 11.

21 'Prophetæ et Apostoli, super quos omnium Ecclesiarum fundamenta locantur.' *S. Hieron. in Psal.* xvii. [vol. vii. App. p. 42.] 'Super Prophetas ædificatur orbis terrarum, credens in Domino.' *Ruffin. Ibid.* [p. 36.]

22 'Fides est habitus quo assentimus dictis Scripturæ propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis.' *Durand. lib.* iii. *Dist.* 24. *q.* i. §. 9. [§. 5.]

23 Οὐχ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις συνετέθη τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ καιριώτατα συλλεχθέντα μίαν ἀναπληροῖ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. *Cyril. Catech.* [v. 12. p. 78 C.] 'Ecclesiarum Patres de populorum salute solliciti, ex diversis voluminibus Scripturarum collegerunt testimonia divinis gravida Sacramentis.' *Euseb. Gall. in Symb.* [Bibl. Patr. vol. v. pt. i. p. 552 E.]

Church, whose body consisteth of faithful members, and so the author of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of Faith, he must needs be imagined to have appointed some external expression and communication of it: especially considering that the sound of the Apostles was to go forth unto the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the Gospel, and gathered into the Church of Christ; which cannot be performed without an acknowledgment of the truth, and a profession of Faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to Baptism. *What doth hinder me to be baptized?* saith the Eunuch. *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that Faith, he was admitted. *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation*[24]. The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the Soul, and act of Faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same. The confession of the mouth is an external signification of the inward habit or act of Faith, by words expressing an acknowledgment of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. The ear receiveth the word, *Faith cometh by hearing;* the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*[25]. In the heart Faith is seated: with the tongue confession is made; between these two salvation is completed[26]. *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* This Faith of the heart every one ought, and is presumed to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the *CREED, I believe;* and if true, he may with comfort say, *The word of Faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart*[27]*:* first in my heart

Acts viii. 36, 37.

Rom. x. 10.

Rom. x. 17.

Mat. xii. 34.

Rom. x. 9.

Rom. x. 8.

24 'Habes, homo, unde credere debeas, *Corde creditur ad justitiam*; habes unde debeas confiteri, *Ore confessio fit ad salutem.*' *Chrysol. Serm.* 56. [p. 702 F.]

25 'Sermo creat auditum, auditus concipit fidem, credulitatem parturit fides, confessionem credulitas nutrit, confessio perpetuam dat salutem.' *Chrysol. Serm.* 60. [p. 705 C.]

26 'Magnum, filioli, per hoc fidei nostræ videmus esse compendium, quando inter cor et linguam totum salutis humanæ versatur et geritur Sacramentum.' *Chrysol. Serm.* 56. [p. 702 F.] 'Quod a te et pro te reposcitur, intra te est, i. e. oris famulatus et cordis affectus.' *Euseb. Gall.* [de Symb. Hom. ii. p. 554 C.]

27 'De hoc sine dubio legimus per

really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the Prophet David, *I have believed, therefore have I* Psal. cxvi.
13 *spoken.* Thus briefly from the second consideration concerning 10.
confession implied in the first words *I believe*, we shall pass unto the third consideration, of the necessity and particular obligation to such a confession.

If there were no other argument, yet being the object of Faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to be so by every one that believeth, being it is the nature of Truth not to hide itself, but rather to desire the light that it might appear; this were sufficient to move us to a confession of our Faith. But beside the nature of the thing, we shall find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such a profession. For first, from the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the object of our Faith, by which we came under a possibility of Faith, we have also received an express command to make a confession of the same: *Be ready*, saith St. Peter, *always* 1 Pet. iii.
to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the 15.
hope that is in you; and there can be no reason of hope but what is grounded on Faith, nor can there be answer given unto that without an acknowledgment of this. Secondly, it is true indeed that the great promises of the Gospel are made unto Faith, and glorious things are spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the confession of Faith together with it; and Rom. x. 10.
we know who it is hath said, *Whosoever shall confess me before* Mat. x. 32.
men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. Besides, the profession of the Faith of one Christian confirmeth and edifieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an obligation upon every particular. Again, the matters of Faith contain so much purity of doctrine, persuade such holiness of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so merciful in his Son, so wonderful in all his works, that the sole confession of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly the concealing those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so far from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoureth the Faith which it refuseth or neglecteth

Prophetam, *Prope est,* inquit, *in ore tuo, et in corde tuo.' Euseb. Gall.* [de Symb. Hom. ii. p. 554 C.]

to profess, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the author of it, as if God had revealed that which Man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us hath also said unto us, *Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy Angels.* Such a necessity there is of confession of Faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorified in it; in respect of ourselves, who shall be rewarded for it; and in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisdom of the Church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the *CREED* at the first initiation into the Church[28] by Baptism (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to be baptized

Luke ix. 26.

28 'Ο τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῆ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε. *Iren. lib.* i. *cap.* i. [i. 9. 4. p. 46.] 'Quum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.' *Tertul. de Baptis.* [6. p. 226 D.] 'In quem tingueret? in pœnitentiam? quo ergo illi præcursorem? in peccatorum remissionem, quam verbo dabat? in semetipsum, quem humilitate celabat? in Spiritum Sanctum, qui nondum a Patre descenderat? in Ecclesiam, quam nondum Apostoli struxerant?' *Idem.* [11. p. 228 C.] 'Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.' *Id. de Cor. Militis.* [3. p. 102 A.] 'Sed et ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in Baptismo testis est veritatis; nam cum dicimus, *Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam?* intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari.' *S. Cyprian. Epist. ad Januarium, &c.* [Ep. lxx. p. 125.] 'Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse quod videatur in interrogatione Baptismi a nobis non discrepare: sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis et schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Ecclesiam.' *Idem, Epist. ad Magnum.* [Ep. lxxvi. p. 154.] 'Mos ibi (*id est Romæ*) servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam Baptismi suscepturi sunt, publice, i. e. fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum reddere.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [3. p. cxcix.] 'Solenne est in lavacro, post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, *Credis in sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum?*' *S. Hieron. cont. Lucifer.* [vol. ii. p. 184 D.] 'Mens Hæretica reliquit doctorem a quo fidem Ecclesiæ didicerat, oblita est pacti Dei sui, hoc est, fidei ipsius Dominicæ quæ in Symbolo continetur, quam se die baptismatis servaturum esse promiserat.' *Idem, Com. in Prov.* 'Interrogatus es, *Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* dixisti, *Credo*, et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, *Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, et in crucem ejus?* dixisti, *Credo*, et mersisti, ideo et Christo es consepultus.—Tertio interrogatus, *Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum?* dixisti, *Credo;* tertio mersisti: ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.' *Ambros. de Sacram. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [§. 20. vol. ii. p. 359 D.] Leo speaks thus of Eutyches in his Epistle to Flavianus, 'Quam enim eruditionem de sacris

14 immediately before[29] the great solemnity of Easter), and to

Novi et Veteris Testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui ne ipsius quidem Symboli initia comprehendit? et quod per totum mundum omnium regenerandorum voce depromitur, istius adhuc senis corde non capitur.' [Ep. xxiv. vol. i. p. 478.] And in the 12th Book *de Trinitate*, [p. 304.] (formerly attributed to Athanasius, but more probably now thought to belong to Vigilius Tapsensis,) 'Nec non et illa magna et beata Confessio Fidei, imo ipsa Fides Sanctorum, et Testamentum quod disposuimus ad Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, ad sacrum lavacrum regenerationis venientes, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unigenitum, et in Spiritum Sanctum.*' Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων ἔν τε τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν. Eusebius, of the Confession of Faith, which he exhibited to the Council of Nice. *Socrat. lib.* i. *cap.* 8. [p. 23.] *Theodoret. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 38.] 'Abrenuncio, inquis, Diabolo, pompis, spectaculis, et operibus ejus: et quid postea? *Credo*, inquis, *in Deum Patrem omnipotentem.*' *Salvian. de Gubern. Dei, lib.* vi. [c. vi. Galland. vol. x. p. 35 C.] And when this Creed was enlarged by the Council of Nice, and after that by others, Epiphanius commends it to the Catechumeni, to be repeated at their baptism: Οὕτως ἕκαστον τῶν κατηχουμένων τῶν μελλόντων τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσίεναι, οὐ μόνον ἀπαγγέλλειν ὀφείλετε τὸ πιστεύειν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν υἱοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκειν ῥητῶς, ὡς πάντων ἡ αὐτὴ μήτηρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν, τὸ λέγειν· Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, &c. *Epiph. in Ancorato.* [119. vol. ii. p. 122 B.] And when he had yet farther enlarged it by reason of some new emergent heresies, he commends it, μάλιστα τοῖς τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσιοῦσιν, ἵνα ἀπαγγέλλωσι καὶ λέγωσιν οὕτως. *Ibid.* [121. p. 123 C.] The first Council of Constantinople confirms the Nicene Confession, as πρεσβυτάτην τε οὖσαν καὶ ἀκόλουθον τῷ βαπτίσματι. *Theodoret. lib.* v. *cap.* 9. p. [205.] And the Council of Chalcedon of the same, ἣν, ὡς κοινὸν ἐξ ἁγίων σύνθημα, τοῖς μυουμένοις πρὸς τὴν τῆς υἱοθεσίας παρεγγυῶμεν ἀσφάλειαν. *Parte tertia.* [Mansi, Concilia, vol. vii. p. 457 A.] The Synod at Jerusalem, τὸ ἅγιον σύμβολον εἰς ὃ ἐβαπτίσθημεν καὶ βαπτίζομεν. The Synod at Tyre, ἐν αὐτῷ βαπτισθέντες καὶ βαπτίζοντες. And the Council of Constantinople under Menna, to which the former sent their Synodical letters, τὸ ἅγιον σύμβολον ἐν ᾧ πάντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν. *Concil. Constantinop. sub Agap. et Menna, Act.* v. [Mansi, viii. p. 1044 E.] Basiliscus and Marcus, in two several edicts, confirmed the same Nicene Creed with these words, εἰς ὃ ἡμεῖς τε καὶ πάντες οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πιστεύσαντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν. *Evagr. lib.* iii. *cap.* 4. et 7. And the edict of the Emperor Justinian, 'Anathematizaverunt eos qui aliam definitionem fidei, sive Symbolum, sive Mathema, tradunt accedentibus ad sanctum baptisma*.'

[29] "Οτι δεῖ τοὺς φωτιζομένους τὴν πίστιν ἐκμανθάνειν, καὶ τῇ πέμπτῃ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἀπαγγέλλειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. *Concil. Laodic. Can.* 46. [Mansi, ii. p. 571 C.] Where it is to be observed, that Πίστις is taken for the Creed or *Symbolum Fidei*, and was so translated anciently, as appeareth by the Canon preserved in the Canon Law, and rendered thus, 'Baptizandos oportet Fidei Symbolum discere, et quinta feria ultimæ septimanæ vel Episcopo vel Presbyteris reddere.' *De Consec. dist.* 4. *cap.* 58†. 'Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus Ecclesiis una die, i. e. ante octo dies Dominicæ resurrectionis, publice in

* [Though Pearson has clearly proved, that it was customary for some Confession of faith to be recited at baptism, he has left it uncertain whether this was the Apostles' Creed or no; and some of his quotations might seem to shew that the Nicene Creed was used in this way. But Bishop Bull has observed, that the Nicene Creed was not intended to be recited at baptism, *Jud. Eccl. Cath.* vi. 4, where he has treated this subject with great learning. See also Bingham's *Antiquities*, x. 4, 17. There seems some allusion to this recitation of a creed at baptism in Heb. x. 22, 23. 1 Pet. iii. 21.]

† [For this meaning of πίστις, see Suicer *in v.* p. 726.]

require a particular repetition[30] of it publicly, as often as the sacrament of the Eucharist was administered, and a constant and perpetual inculcation of the same by the Clergy[31] to the People.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice useful and advantageous; so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe*. As if Christ did question every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind, after he had restored him his sight (and we are all in his condition), *Dost thou believe on the Son of God?* every single Christian is taught to make the same answer which he made, *Lord, I believe*. As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered together in his name, what he promised to *one of the multitude, whose son had a dumb spirit; If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth;* each one for himself returneth his answer, *Lord, I believe; Lord, help my unbelief*. Not that it is unlawful or unfit to use another number, and instead of *I*, to say *We believe:* for taking in of others, we exclude not ourselves; and addition of charity can be no disparagement to confession of Faith. St. Peter answered for the twelve, *We believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ, the*

John ix. 35, 38.

Mark ix. 17, 23, 24.

John vi. 69.

Ecclesia competentibus tradi.' *Concil. Agath. Can.* 13. [Mansi, viii. p. 327 A.] 'Sicut antiqui Canones jubent, ante viginti dies Baptismi ad purgationem exorcismi Catechumeni currant, in quibus viginti diebus omnino Catechumeni Symbolum, quod est, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*, specialiter doceantur.' *Concil. Bracar.* 3. *Can.* 1. [Mansi, ix. p. 838 D.] The Canon of the Laodicean Council, already mentioned, is verbatim rehearsed in the sixth Council in Trullo. *Can.* 78. [Mansi, xi. p. 977 B.] It appeareth therefore a general command of the Church, that those who were to be baptized should have a certain time allotted for the learning and rehearsing of the Creed. And in case of necessity, if any were baptized, they were to learn the Creed immediately after their baptism, "Οτι δεῖ (not, as it is in the edition of Binius, both in this Canon and in the former, most absurdly "Οτι οὐ δεῖ) τοὺς ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβάνοντας τὸ φώτισμα, καὶ εἶτα ἀναστάντας, ἐκμανθάνειν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι θείας δωρεᾶς κατηξιώθησαν. *Concil. Laodic. Can.* 47. [Mansi, ii. p. 571 C.]

[30] As appears in the ancient Greek Liturgies, and the decree of the third Council of Toledo: 'Ut omni sacrificii tempore ante communionem corporis Christi et sanguinis, juxta Orientalium partium morem, unanimiter clara voce sacratissimum fidei recenseant symbolum.' [Mansi, ix. p. 990 A.] Which custom, as they call it, of the Oriental parts, is said first to be introduced by Petrus Mongus at Alexandria, and after by Timotheus at Constantinople, as appears out of the fragments of Theodorus Lector*.

[31] 'Symbolum quod est signaculum fidei, et orationem Dominicam dicere semper admoneant sacerdotes populum Christianum.' *Concil. Mogunt. Can.* 45. [Mansi, xiv. p. 74 B.]

* [It was not used to be repeated in the daily service till about the middle of the fifth century in the Greek Church, and not till some time after in the Latin Church. Bingham, x. 4, 17, who quotes several authorities.]

Son of the living God. For though Christ immediately replied that *one of them had a devil*, yet is not St. Peter blamed, who knew it not. But every one is taught to express his own Faith, because by that he is to stand or fall. *The effectual fervent* James v. 16. *prayer of a righteous man availeth much* for the benefit of his Brother, but his Faith availeth nothing for the justification of another. And it is otherwise very fit that our Faith should be manifested by a particular confession, because it is effectual by particular application; therefore must it needs be proper for me to say, *I believe*, and to make profession of my *Faith in the Son of* Gal. ii. 20. *God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.*

Being then I have described the true nature and notion of Belief, the duty of confessing our Faith, and the obligation of every particular Christian to believe and to confess; being in these three explications, all which can be imaginably contained in the first word of the *CREED* must necessarily be included; it will now be easy for me to deliver, and for every particular person to understand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he begins his confession with these words, *I believe*, which I conceive may in this manner be fitly expressed:

Although those things which I am ready to affirm be not apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them; although they be not evident to my understanding of themselves, nor appear unto me true by the virtue of any natural and necessary cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science of them; yet being they are certainly contained in the Scriptures, the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets; being those Apostles and Prophets were endued with miraculous power from above, and immediately inspired with the Holy Ghost, and consequently what they delivered was not the word of man, but of God himself; being God is of that universal knowledge and infinite wisdom, that it is impossible he should be deceived; of that indefectible holiness and transcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, and consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true; I readily and steadfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully and absolutely, and more concerningly persuaded of them, than of any thing I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them hath done it, not for my benefit only, but for the advantage of others, nor for that alone, but also for the manifest-

ation of his own glory; being for those ends he hath commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternal reward upon my profession of them; being every particular person is to expect the justification of himself, and the salvation of his soul, upon the condition of his own Faith; as with a certain and full persuasion, I assent unto them, so with a fixed and undaunted resolution I will profess them; and with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole body of the *CREED*, and every Article and particle in it, I sincerely, readily, resolvedly say, *I believe.*

I believe in God.

HAVING delivered the nature of Faith, and the act of Belief common to all the Articles of the Creed, that we may understand what it is to believe; we shall proceed to the explication of the Articles themselves, as the most necessary objects of our Faith, that we may know what is chiefly to be believed. Where immediately we meet with another word as general as the former, and as universally concerned in every Article, which is *GOD;* for if to believe be to assent upon the testimony of God, as we have before declared, then wheresoever belief is expressed or implied, there is also the name of *God* understood, upon whose testimony we believe. He therefore whose authority is the ground and foundation of the whole, his existence begins the Creed, as the foundation of that authority. For if there can be no divine Faith without the attestation of God, by which alone it becomes divine, and there can be no such attestation except there were an existence of the testifier, then must it needs be proper to begin the confession of our Faith with the 16
agnition of our God. If his name[32] were thought fit to be expressed in the front of every action, even by the Heathen, because they thought no action prospered but by his approbation; much more ought we to fix it before our confession, because without him to believe, as we profess, is no less than a contradiction.

Now these words, *I believe in God,* will require a double consideration; one, of the phrase or manner of speech; another, of the thing or nature of the truth in that manner expressed. For to *believe* with an addition of the preposition *in**, is a phrase or

[32] Θεός, θεός· Ἔθος ἦν ὅτε κατάρχοιντό τινος, θεὸν λέγειν ἐπευφημιζομένοις. *Hesych. Lex.*

* [See the Homily upon Faith, at the beginning.]

expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to God himself, as always implying, beside a bare act of Faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An observation, as I conceive, prevailing especially in the Latin Church, grounded principally upon the authority of St. Augustin[33]. Whereas among the Greeks, in whose language the New Testament was penned, I perceive no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the Creed; and in the Hebrew language[34] of the Old, from which

33 For, *Ser.* 181, which is upon the Creed, we find these words: 'Non dicit, Credo Deum, vel Credo Deo, quamvis et hæc saluti necessaria sint. Aliud enim est credere illi, aliud credere illum, aliud credere in illum. Credere illi, est credere vera esse quæ loquitur; credere illum, credere quia ipse est Deus; credere in illum, diligere illum.' [vol. vi. p. 279 A. append.] And though that collection of Sermons *de tempore* under the name of St. Augustin be not all his, (divers of them being translations of the Greek homilies,) yet this distinction may be collected out of other parts of his works. For first he distinguisheth very clearly and seriously between *credere Deo*, and *credere in Deum*. 'Numquam aliquis Apostolorum dicere auderet, qui credit in me.—Credimus Apostolo, sed non credimus in Apostolum.' *Tract.* 54. *in Psalm.* [Tract. 54. in Joan. Evang. §. 3. vol. iii. p. 650 D.] And again, 'Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum.' [Tract. 29. in Joan. p. 515 D.] Secondly, he distinguisheth between *credere Deum* and *credere in Deum*: 'Multum interest utrum quis credat ipsum esse Christum, et utrum credat in Christum. Ille credit in Christum qui et sperat in Christum, et diligit Christum.' *De Verbis Dom. Serm.* 61. [144. cap. ii. §. 2. vol. v. p. 693 F.] And, which is the sum of all, he puts a high value upon the preposition, as if, by virtue of the addition of *in*, the phrase did properly signify so great an accession unto faith. 'Quid est credere in Deum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, et ejus membris incorporari.' *Tract.* 29. *in Joh.* [§. 6. vol. iii. p. 515 D.] Which doctrine of St. Augustin's being taken notice of by Peter Lombard, hath since been continued by the Schoolmen; and Aquinas, *Sum.* ii. 2æ. *q.* 2. Art. i. §. 2. *ad primum*, bringing all three under one act of faith, hath been contradicted by Durandus, *in* 3 *Sent. dis.* xxiii. *q.* 7. §. 6. 'Credere in Deum non est præcise actus fidei, sed fidei et caritatis simul; et sunt etiam plures, et non unus actus tantum:' by whose subtle, but yet clear determination, (as many of his are beyond the rest of the Schools,) whatsoever is added by the preposition to *believe*, appears not to be a part of belief, but an act superadded to the act of faith.

34 For אמן is sometimes joined with ל, sometimes with ב: when with ל, it answers properly to *πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ*, *credere Deo*, ל being nothing else but a significator of the case; when with ב, it corresponds to *πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν*, *credere in Deum*, ב being a preposition of the same nature with *εἰς* or *in*. But yet there is so little, or rather no difference in the Hebrew, that in the first place where it is used, and that of the father of the faithful, even for the act of justifying faith, והאמן ביהוה Gen. xv. 6. it is translated by the LXX. *καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβρὰμ τῷ Θεῷ*, not *εἰς Θεόν*, and that translation warranted by St. Paul, Rom. iv. 3. Gal. iii. 6. and St. James ii. 23. In the same manner, 2 Kings xvii. 14. אשר לא האמינו ביהוה אלהיהם is translated by the LXX. (as that translation is preserved in the Alexandrian and Complutensian copies) *οἱ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν κυρίῳ Θεῷ αὐτῶν*. Besides, the same phrase is used in the same place both to God, and to man, as Exod. xiv. 31. ויאמינו ביהוה ובמשה עבדו: *And they believed in God, and in his servant Moses;* which the Chaldee paraphrase explaineth thus, והמינו במימרא דיי ובנביאות משה עבדיה: *And they believed in the word of God, and in the prophecy of*

the Jewish and Christian Greeks received that phrase of *believing in*, it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification. For it is sometimes attributed to God, the author and original cause; sometimes to the Prophets, the immediate revealers of the Faith; sometimes it is spoken of miracles, the motives to believe; sometimes of the Law of God, the material object of our Faith. Among all which varieties of that phrase of speech, it is sufficiently apparent that in this confession of Faith it is most proper to admit it in the last acception, by which it is attributed to the 17
material object of belief. For the Creed being nothing else but a brief comprehension of the most necessary matters of Faith, whatsoever is contained in it beside the first word *I believe*, by which we make confession of our Faith, can be nothing else but part of those verities to be believed, and the act of belief in respect of them nothing but an assent unto them as divinely credible and infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the Ancient Greek Fathers of the Church could have any farther meaning in it, who make the whole body of the Creed to be of the same nature, as so many truths to be believed, acknowledged,

Moses his servant. And 2 Chron. xx. 20. האמינו ביהוה אלהיכם והאמנו האמינו בנביאיו והצליחו: *Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established: believe in his Prophets, so shall ye prosper.* For although the vulgar Latin, which our translation followeth, hath made that distinction which the Hebrew maketh not, 'Credite in Domino Deo vestro, et securi eritis; credite Prophetis ejus, et cuncta evenient prospera:' yet the Septuagint acknowledgeth no necessity of receding from the original phrase; Ἐμπιστεύσατε ἐν κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐμπιστευθήσεσθε· ἐμπιστεύσατε ἐν προφήταις αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐοδωθήσεσθε. Nor is it only attributed to Moses as joined with God, and so taken as it were into the same phrase, but separately by himself, as Exod. xix. 9. *The Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee,* וגם בך יאמינו לעולם *and believe in thee for ever.* And therefore, when it was objected to St. Basil, that they did believe in Moses, as well as that they were baptized into Moses; and generally, ἡ πίστις ὡμολόγηται ἤδη καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους γεγενῆσθαι· the Father doth not deny the language, but interprets it, ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν πίστις ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἀναφέρεται. *De Sp. S. cap.* 14. §. 31–33. [vol. iii. p. 25 D 27 C.] Neither is this only spoken of Moses and the Prophets, that the Israelites believed in them, but of David, not as a Prophet, but as a bare relater of his own actions, 1 Sam. xxvii. 12, ויאמן אכיש בדוד, Καὶ ἐπιστεύθη Ἀκχὶς ἐν Δαυίδ. 'Et credidit Achis in David.' *Vulg.* 'Est ergo fides nostra primo quidem omnium in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, consequenter vero etiam in omnes sanctos Patriarchas, vel Prophetas, vel Apostolos Christi.' *Orig. in Apol. Pamphil.* [Orig. vol. iv. Appendix, p. 38 B.] To conclude, this general phrase of *believing in* is originally attributed sometimes to the supreme Author of our faith, as to God; sometimes to the intervenient messengers, as the Prophets; sometimes to the motives of our faith, Psalm lxxviii. 32. ולא האמינו בנפלאתיו: LXX. Καὶ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ἐν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ, *And they believed not for his wondrous works;* sometimes to the object of it, or that which is believed, as Psalm cxix. 66. במצותיך האמנתי, *I have believed in thy commandments,* as Mar. i. 15. Πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

and confessed; insomuch as sometimes they use not *believing in*[35], neither for the Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost; sometimes using it as to them, they continue[36] the same to the following Articles of, *the Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints*, &c. and generally[37] speak of the Creed as of nothing but mere matter of Faith, without any intimation of hope, love[38], or any such notion included in it. So that *believing in*, by virtue of the phrase or manner of speech, whether we look upon the original use of it in the Hebrew, or the derivative in the Greek, or the sense of it in the first Christians in the Latin Church, can be of no farther real importance in the Creed in respect of God, who immediately follows, than to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagined a slender

35 Πιστεύομεν οὖν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕνα μόνον ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν Θεὸν—καὶ ἕνα τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱόν,—καὶ ἓν μόνον πνεῦμα ἅγιον. *S. Basil.* [de Fide, c. iv. vol. ii. p. 227 B.]

36 Arius and Euzoius in their Confession delivered to Constantine, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα—καὶ εἰς κύριον Ἰησοῦν—καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [p. 61.] *Sozomen. lib.* ii. *cap.* 27. [p. 83.] Κατήχησις τῶν φωτιζομένων — σχεδιασθεῖσα εἰς τὸ καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον — καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. *S. Cyril. Hierosol.* [Cateches. xvi. et xviii. init.] Εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον—εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *S. Epiphan. in Ancorato.* [§. 120. vol. ii. p. 123 A.] And in a larger Confession, Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [§. ult. p. 124 C.]

37 Gregorius Nyssenus calls them εὐσεβεῖς περὶ Θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις. And Eusebius, in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice, concludes, Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες· [Socrat. i. 8. p. 23.] signifying that every particular* which he had rehearsed he believed to be; and that was all in the Confession intended. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, after a long declaration of the former Articles concerning the Father and the Son, draws to a conclusion on the latter Articles thus: Πρὸς δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ (l. εὐσεβεῖ) ταύτῃ περὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ δόξῃ ——— ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὁμολογοῦμεν ——— μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ——— μετὰ τοῦτον (vel τοῦτο) τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν οἴδαμεν. *Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [p. 19, 20.] So *Tertul. de Præscr. Adv. Hæret.* [c. 13. p. 206 D.] 'Regula est fidei illa qua creditur unum omnino Deum esse:' and *adv. Praxeam, cap.* 2. [p. 501 B.] where he makes another rehearsal of his Creed, he begins with 'Unicum quidem Deum credimus.'

38 'Non est amor Dei Articulus, neque etiam amor proximi, quia etiamsi sint præcepta generalia activa, tamen cum actio contineatur, non oportet eum constituere articulum: sed ista sunt fidei dogmata quæ sunt columnæ et fundamenta legis divinæ.' *Is. Abravanel de cap. fidei, cap.* 11. 'Primus est deorum cultus, Deos credere.' *Sen.* [Epist. 95.]

* [This is not quite correct: τούτων ἕκαστον means *each of these three persons*, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and Eusebius says, We believe that each of these has a real and substantial existence; that the Father is really a Father, and the Son really a Son, not as the Sabellians say.]

notion or small part of the first Article of our Faith, when it really is the foundation of this and all the rest; that as the Creed is fundamental in respect of other truths, this is the
Heb. xi. 6. foundation[39] even of the fundamentals: *For he that cometh to God must believe that he is.* And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, *I believe in God,* that is, *I believe that God is.*

As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration, first of the notion of God, what is here understood by that name; secondly, of the Existence of God, how we know or believe that he is; thirdly,
1 Cor. viii. 5. the Unity of God, in that though *there be gods many and lords many,* yet in our Creed we mention him as but one. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered what is the true notion of God in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure ourselves of the existence of such a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first Article; then may every one understand what he says, and upon what grounds he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe in God.*

The name of God is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him who by way of eminency and excellency
Deut. x. 17. Psalm cxxxvi. 2. Dan. ii. 47. and xi. 36. Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22. Rom. ix. 5. Ep. iv. 6. bears that name, and therefore is styled *God of gods; The Lord our God is God of gods, and Lord of lords:* and in the same respect is called *the most high God* (others being but inferior or 18
under him), and *God over* or *above all*[40]. This eminency and excellency, by which these titles become proper unto him and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not,
Gal. iv. 8. and therefore are not by nature gods. *Then when ye knew not God,* saith St. Paul, *ye did service unto them which by nature are not gods.* There is then a God by nature, and others which are called gods, but by nature are not so: for either they have no power at all, because no being, but only in the false opinions of deceived men, as the gods of the Heathen; or

[39] יסוד היסודות ועמוד החכמות לידע שיש שם מצוי ראשון והוא ממציא כל־נמצא: *The foundation of foundations and pillar of wisdoms is to know that the first being is, and that it giveth existence to every thing which is. Maimon. de Fundam. Legis, cap.* i. 1.

[40] 'Imprimis necesse est concedatis esse aliquem sublimiorem Deum et mancipem quendam divinitatis qui ex hominibus Deos fecerit.' *Tertul. adv. Gentes.* [c. 11. p. 11 D.]

if they have any real power or authority, from whence some are called[41] Gods in the Scripture, yet have they it not from themselves or of their own nature, but from him who *only hath immortality,* and consequently only Divinity, and therefore is the *only true God.* So that the notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signify a being or nature of infinite perfection[42]; and the infinite perfection of a nature or being consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of itself; and potential or causative of all beings beside itself, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed. It is true indeed that to give a perfect definition of God is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity: but yet a sense of this Divinity we have, and the first and common notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a Being of itself, and independent from any other; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; that it governs all things. And this I conceive sufficient as to the first consideration, in reference to the notion of a God.

1 Tim. vi. 16.

John xvii. 3.

As for the existence of such a Being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what means we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is. For although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connatural to the Soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a God; yet I rather conceive the Soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning; but being we can have no assurance of its preexistence, we may more rationally judge it to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the Soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth table, without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection; then must we not refer the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion; at least we are assured God never chargeth us with the knowledge of him upon that account.

Again, although others do affirm, that the existence of God is

41 '*Ego dixi, Dii estis;* sed in eo indulti nominis significatio est: et ubi refertur, *Ego dixi,* loquentis potius est sermo quam rei nomen.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* vii. [§. 10. p. 921 C.]

42 'Deus plenæ ac perfectæ divinitatis est nomen.' *Hilar. de Trin. lib.* xi. [c. 48. p. 1110.] 'Deus substantiæ ipsius nomen, id est, Divinitatis.' *Tertul. adv. Hermog.* [c. 3. p. 234 B.]

a truth evident of itself, so as whosoever hears but these terms once named, that *God is,* cannot choose but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater than any part, who knoweth only what is meant by *whole,* and what by *part:* so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of God, who knows but what is meant by God, and what it is *to be;* yet can we not ground our knowledge of God's existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence: nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced; it being a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because it is evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore only doubts of it, because it is not evident unto him.

Although therefore that *God is,* be of itself an immediate, 19
certain, necessary truth, yet must it be evidenced[43] and made apparent unto us by its connexion unto other truths; so that the being of the Creator may appear unto us by his Creature, and the dependency of inferior entities lead us to a clear acknowledgment of the supreme and independent Being. The
Wisd. of Sol. xiii. 5. wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper, *for by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, proportionably the maker of them is seen:* and not only they, but St. Paul hath taught us,
Rom. i. 20. that[44] *the invisible things of God from the Creation of the World*

43 'Hæc propositio, Deus est, quantum in se est, per se nota est, quia prædicatum est idem cum subjecto, Deus enim est suum esse.—Sed quia nos non scimus de Deo quid est, non est nobis per se nota, sed indiget demonstrari per ea quæ sunt magis nota quoad nos, et minus nota quoad naturam, scilicet per effectus.' *Aquin.* 1. *p. q.* 2. *Art.* i.*

44 This place must be vindicated from the false gloss of Socinus†, who contends that it cannot be proved from the creature that there is a God, and therefore to this place of St. Paul answers thus: 'Sciendum est verba *a creatione mundi* debere conjungi cum verbo *invisibilia*—Ait igitur eo in loco Apostolus, *æternam divinitatem Dei,* i. e. id quod nos Deus perpetuo facere vult, (*Divinitas* enim hoc sensu alibi quoque apud ipsum enunciatur, ut Col. ii. 9.) *æternamque potentiam,* i. e. promissiones quæ nunquam intercident, (quo sensu paulo superius dixerat *Evangelium esse potentiam Dei,*) hæc, inquam, quæ nunquam, postquam mundus creatus fuerat, ab hominibus visa fuerant, i. e. non fuerant eis cognita, *per opera,* hoc est, per mirabiles ipsius Dei et divinorum hominum, præsertim vero Christi et Apostolorum

* [Barrow reduces the arguments for the being of a God to four: "The first is "drawn from natural effects, observable by every man: a second, from the com- "mon opinions and practices of mankind from all antiquity: a third, from parti- "cular discoveries of such a divine power attested by history: a fourth, from every "man's particular experience concerning a divine Providence." Vol. vi. p. 94.]

† [The passage is in Prælectiones Theologicæ, cap. ii. vol. i. p. 538. ed. 1656.]

are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even

ejus operationes, conspecta fuisse.' In which explication there is nothing which is not forced and distorted: for though his first observation seem plausible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for proof, Matt. xiii. 35, *κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, which proves not at all that *ἀπὸ κτίσεως* has the same sense: and it is more probable that it hath not, because that is usually expressed by *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*, Mark x. 6, and xiii. 19, 2 Peter iii. 4, never by *ἀπὸ κτίσεως*. Besides, the *κεκρυμμένα* in St. Matthew bears not that analogy with *ἀόρατα* which Socinus pretends, signifying not things unseen or unknown till then, but only obscure sayings or parables; for which purpose those words were produced out of the Psalms by the Evangelist, to prove that the Messias was to speak in parables, in the original חידות מני-קדם LXX. *προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, i. e. wise, ancient sayings, which were not unseen and unknown, for it immediately followeth, *which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us*, Psalm lxxviii. 3. And though he would make out this interpretation, by accusing other interpreters of unfaithfulness, 'Plerique interpretes ex præpositione *a*, *ex* fecerunt, contra ipsorum Græcorum Codicum fidem, qui non *ἐκ κτίσεως* sed *ἀπὸ κτίσεως* habent;' *Ibid.* yet there is no ground for such a calumny, because *ἀπό* may be, and is often, rendered *e* or *ex* as well as *ἐκ*, as Matt. iii. 4, *ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου*, *e pilis camelinis*, vii. 4, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου*, *ex oculo tuo*, 16, *ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν*, *ex spinis*; and even in the sense which Socinus contends for, Matt. xvii. 18, *ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης*, *Vulg. ex illa hora*, as Tully, 'ex eo die,' and Virgil.—

Ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis. Ecl. vii. 70.

And,

Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis
Trojanæ. Æn. i. 623.

So the Greek *ἀπὸ μέρους* the Latins render *ex parte*, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου*, *ex æquo*: of which examples are innumerable*. There is no unfaithfulness then imputable to the interpreters; nor can such pitiful criticisms give any advantage to the first part of Socinus's exposition†. Howsoever the Catholic interpretation depends not on those words *ἀπὸ κτίσεως*, but on the consideration of the persons, that is the Gentiles, and the other words, *ποιήμασι νοούμενα*, which he farther perverts, rendering them the *miraculous operations* of Christ and his Apostles, or, as one of our learned men, their *doings*, mistaking *ποίημα*, which is from the passive *πεποίημαι*, for *ποίησις*, from the active *ἐποίησα·* for *ποίημα* is properly the thing made or created, not the operation or doing of it; as *κτίσις* is sometimes taken for the *creature*, sometimes for the *creation*, but *κτίσμα* is the *creature* only. As therefore we read, 1 Tim. iv. 4, *πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν*, so Eph. ii. 10, *αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα*. In this sense spake Thales properly, *Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων Θεὸς, ἀγέννητον γάρ· κάλλιστον κόσμος, ποίημα γὰρ Θεοῦ. Diog. Laert.*, [Lib. i. §. 35.] The other interpretations, which he was forced to, are yet more extravagant: as when he renders the *eternal Godhead*, that which God would always have us do, or his everlasting will, and proves that rendition by another place of St. Paul, Col. ii. 9, *For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, that is, says he,

* [The following passages are perhaps still more to the purpose: Matt. vii. 20, *ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς*. xi. 19, *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*. xvi. 21, *πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*. Luke xvii. 25, *ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης*. Act. ii. 22, *ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένον*. Apoc. xii. 6, *τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*.]

† [Pearson's interpretation of the words *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου*, in Rom. i. 20, which is the common interpretation, is rendered almost certain by the following passages: *πάσῃ θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται ὁ Θεός*. Aristot. *de Mundo*, c. 6. §. 26. *ἀπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ κάλλος ἀναφοιτῆσαι δεήσει. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ δεῖ θεωρεῖν*. Plato apud Cyril. Alex. *adv. Julian.* iii. vol. vi. p. 97 D.]

his eternal Power and Godhead. For if Phidias[45] could so contrive a piece of his own work, as in it to preserve the memory of himself, never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work, well may we read the great Artificer of the World in the works of his own hands, and by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first Cause of all things.

We find by the experience of ourselves, that some things in this World have a beginning, before which they were not; the account of the years of our age sufficiently infer our nativities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to itself. Whatsoever is, must of necessity either have been made or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made. For whatsoever is made, is made by another, neither can any thing produce itself; otherwise it would follow, that the same thing is and is not at the same instant in the same respect; it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced: it is therefore in being, and is not in being; which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were 20
made by some other, that other which produced them either was itself produced, or was not; and if not, then have we already an independent being; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an infinite succession in casualties[46], by which nothing will be made: both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confess was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings, singly considered by themselves, do not infer one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things shew as much[47]; and this one

all the will of God, (whereas it is most certain, that where the Godhead is, especially where the *fulness*, even *all the fulness* of the *Godhead* is, there must be all the attributes as well as the will of God:) and when he interprets the *eternal power* to be the promises which shall never fail; and thinks he has sufficiently proved it, because the same Apostle calls the Gospel the *power of God*. For by this way of interpretation no sentence of Scripture can have any certain sense.

45 In the shield of Pallas. *Aristot. de Mundo.* [c. vi. §. 29.]

46 Ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι γ' ἐστὶν ἀρχή τις, καὶ οὐκ ἄπειρα τὰ αἴτια τῶν ὄντων, οὔτ' εἰς εὐθυωρίαν, οὔτε κατ' εἶδος, δῆλον. *Aristot. Metaph. lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. [lib. i. (min.) c. 2. §. 1.], and again, Εἴπερ μηδέν ἐστι τὸ πρῶτον, ὅλως αἴτιον οὐδέν ἐστι. [Ib. §. 4.]

47 Πόθεν δῆλον εἰ ὅλως ἐστὶ θεός; Ἐκ

supreme Cause is *God*. For all things which we see or know have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth the uses and utilities of every species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause; and a final cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing than as it moves the efficient cause to work: from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, indued with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of the ends of all, designed, produced, and disposed all things to those ends.

Again, as all things have their existence, so have they also their operations for some end[18]; and whatsoever worketh so, must needs be directed to it. Although then those creatures which are indued with reason, can thereby apprehend the goodness of the end for which they work, and make choice of such means as are proportionable and proper for the obtaining of it, and so by their own counsel direct themselves unto it: yet can we not conceive, that other natural Agents, whose operations flow from a bare instinct, can be directed in their actions by any counsel of their own. The stone doth not deliberate whether it shall descend, nor doth the wheat take counsel whether it shall grow or no. Even Men in natural actions use no act of deliberation: we do not advise how our heart shall beat, though without that pulse we cannot live; when we have provided nutriment for our stomach, we take no counsel how it shall be digested there, or how the chyle is distributed to every part for the reparation of the whole; the mother which conceives takes no care how that *conceptus* shall be framed, how all the parts shall be distinguished, and by what means or ways the child shall grow within her womb: and yet all these operations are directed to their proper ends, and that with a greater reason, and therefore by a greater wisdom, than what proceeds from any thing of human understanding. What then can be more clear, than that those natural Agents which work constantly for those ends which they themselves cannot perceive, must be

τῆς τῶν ὄντων συστάσεώς τε καὶ διαμονῆς. *Justin. Quæst. et Resp. ad Græcos*.* [Quæst. iii. 6. p. 539 B.]

48 Ἐν ὅσοις τέλος τί ἐστι, τούτου ἕνεκα πράττεται τὸ πρότερον καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς· οὐκοῦν ὡς πράττεται, οὕτω πέφυκε· καὶ ὡς πέφυκεν, οὕτω πράττεται ἕκαστον, ἂν μή τι ἐμποδίζῃ· πράττεται δὲ ἕνεκά του, καὶ πέφυκεν ἄρα τούτου ἕνεκα. *Aristot. Phys. lib.* ii. *cap.* 8. §. 7.

* [This is certainly not a work of Justin Martyr, and was probably written in the fifth century.]

directed by some high and overruling Wisdom? and who can be their director in all their operations tending to those ends, but he which gave them their beings for those ends? and who is that, but the great Artificer who works in all of them? For Art is so far the imitation of Nature, that if it were not in the Artificer, but in the thing itself which by Art is framed, the works of Art and Nature would be the same[49]. Were that which frames a watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of Man, it would seem to grow into that form; nor would there be any distinction between the making of that watch, and the growing of a plant. Now what the Artificer is to works of Art, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by Nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all natural Agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the Maker to be the Ruler of the World, the Steerer of this great Ship, the Law of this universal Commonwealth, the General of all the hosts of Heaven and Earth[50]. By these ways, as by the testimony of the Creature[51], we come to find an eternal and independent Being, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed; and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of *God*.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the public and universal reason of the world. No age so distant, no country so remote, no people so barbarous, but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth[52]. When the Roman Eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with Atheism nowhere, but rather by their miscellany Deities at Rome, which grew together with their victories, they shewed no nation was without its God. And since the later art of navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the customs of the people be much different, and their manner of Religion hold small correspondency with any in these parts of

49 Ἄτοπον τὸ μὴ οἴεσθαι ἕνεκά του γίνεσθαι, ἐὰν μὴ ἴδωσι τὸ κινοῦν βουλευσάμενον. καίτοι καὶ ἡ τέχνη οὐ βουλεύεται· καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἐνῆν ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ἡ ναυπηγική, ὁμοίως ἂν τῇ φύσει ἐποίει. *Aristot. Phys. lib.* ii. *cap.* 8. [§. 15.]

50 Καθόλου ὅπερ ἐν νηΐ κυβερνήτης, ἐν ἅρματι ἡνίοχος, ἐν χορῷ δὲ κορυφαῖος, ἐν πόλει δὲ νόμος, ἐν στρατοπέδῳ δὲ ἡγεμών, τοῦτο Θεὸς ἐν κόσμῳ. *Arist. de Mund.* [c. vi. §. 34.]

51 'Habet Dominus testimonium totum hoc quod sumus, et in quo sumus.' *Tertul.*

52 Ἀρχαῖός τις λόγος καὶ πάτριός ἐστι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν συνέστηκεν. *Aristot. de Mundo.* [c. vi. §. 2.]

the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a Divinity they acknowledge. Or if any nation be discovered which maketh no profession of piety, and exerciseth no religious observances, it followeth not from thence that they acknowledge no God: for they may only deny his Providence, as the Epicureans did; or if any go farther, their numbers are so few, that they must be inconsiderable in respect of mankind. And therefore so much of the Creed hath been the general confession of all nations[53], *I believe in God.* Which were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could we give of so universal a consent? or how can it be imagined, that all men should conspire to deceive themselves and their posterity[54]?

Nor is the reason only general, and the consent unto it universal, but God hath still preserved and quickened the worship due unto his name, by the patefaction of himself. Things which are to come are so beyond our knowledge, that the wisest man can but conjecture: and being we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of several free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefactions. For none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work; none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends; none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a Prophecy, by the same we may be secured of a Divinity. Except then all the annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of history designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect God's existence, having so ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of Nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed, which is not within the compass of the power of any natural agent; if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or

53 'Nec ulla gens usquam est adeo extra leges moresque projecta, ut non aliquos Deos credat.' *Sen.* [Epist. 117. Other ancient authorities are quoted by Barrow, vol. vi. p. 104.]

54 'Nec in hunc furorem omnes mortales consensissent alloquendi surda numina et inefficaces Deos.' *Sen.* [lib. iv. de Benef. c. 4.]

hath no natural aptitude so to work; it must be ascribed to a cause transcending all natural causes, and disposing all their operations. Thus every miracle proves its Author, and every act of Omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a Deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weakness of our fathers, and the testimony of all former ages, who shall deny that ever any miracle was wrought. *We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what works thou didst in their days, in the times of old. Blessed be the Lord God, who only doth wondrous works.*

Ps. xliv. 1.

Ps. lxxii. 18.

Nor are we only informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their universal cause, or his external patefactions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgment of mankind; but every particular person hath a particular remembrancer in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creator, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of conscience in all men, by which their *thoughts* are ever *accusing, or excusing them;* they feel a comfort in those virtuous actions which they find themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of a Divinity out of their own souls, have not been least sensible of this remembrancer in their breasts. It is true indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of conscience is only grounded upon an opinion of a Deity, and that opinion may be false. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest Writers of most different persuasions, and experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations, do agree, that the remorse of conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth than supposeth an opinion of a Divinity; and that man which most peremptorily denieth God's existence, is the greatest argument himself that there is a God. Let Caligula profess himself an Atheist, and with that profession hide his head, or run under his bed, when the thunder strikes his ears, and lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the justice of God; whom while in his wilful opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth. So that a Deity will

22

Rom. ii. 15.

either be granted or extorted, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Only unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to others; who will not acknowledge[55] his existence, of whose power he cannot be ignorant, *God is not far from every one of us.* The proper discourse of St. Paul to the Philosophers of Athens was, that *they might feel after him and find him.* Some children have been so ungracious as to refuse to give the honour due unto their parent, but never any so irrational as to deny they had a father. As for those who have dishonoured God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore they may wish there were none; but cannot consist with their reason to assert there is none, when even the very Poets of the Heathen have taught us *that we are his offspring.* Acts xvii. 27. Acts xvii. 28.

It is necessary thus to believe there is a God, first, because there can be no Divine Faith without this belief. For all Faith is therefore only Divine, because it relieth upon the authority of God giving testimony to the object of it; but that which hath no being can have no authority, can give no testimony. The ground of his Authority is his Veracity, the foundations of his Veracity are his Omniscience and Sanctity, both which suppose his Essence and Existence, because what is not is neither knowing nor holy.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a Deity, that thereby we may acknowledge such a nature extant as is worthy of, and may justly challenge from us, the highest worship and adoration. For it were vain to be religious and to exercise devotion, except there were a Being to which all such holy applications were most justly due. Adoration implies submission and dejection, so that while we worship we cast down ourselves: there must be therefore some great eminence in the object worshipped, or else we should dishonour our own nature in the worship of it. But when a Being is presented of that intrinsical and necessary perfection, that it depends on nothing, and all things else depend on that, and are wholly governed and disposed by it, this worthily calls us to our knees, and shews the humblest of our devotions to be but just and loyal retributions.

This necessary truth hath been so universally received, that we shall always find all nations of the world more prone unto Idolatry than to Atheism, and readier to multiply than deny the Deity. But our Faith teacheth us equally to deny them both,

55 'Hæc est summa delicti, nolle agnoscere quem ignorare non possis.' *S. Cyprian. de Idol. Van.* [p. 227.]

and each of them is renounced in these words, *I believe in God.* First, *in God* affirmatively, *I believe* he is, against Atheism. Secondly, *in God* exclusively, not in Gods, against Polytheism and Idolatry. Although therefore the existence and Unity of God be two distinct truths, yet are they of so necessary dependance and intimate coherence, that both may be expressed by one word [56], and included in one Article [57].

And that the Unity of the Godhead is concluded in this Article is apparent, not only because the Nicene Council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also because this Creed in the churches of the East [58], before the Council of Nice, had that addition in it, *I believe in one God.* We begin our Creed then, as Plato did his chief and prime epistles [59], who gave this distinction to his friends, that the name of *God* was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of *Gods,* in the plural, to such as were more vulgar and trivial. *Unto thee it was shewed,* saith Moses to Israel, *that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him.* And as

Deut. iv. 35.

56 'Solum Deum confirmas quem tantum Deum nominas.' *Tertul. de Testim. Animæ, cap.* 2. [p. 65 B.] When Leo, Bishop of Rome, in an epistle to Flavianus [Ep. xxiv. c. ii. vol. i. p. 479] had written these words, 'Fidelium universitas profitetur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus;' one of the Eutychians objected with this question, 'Cur non dixerit in *unum* Deum Patrem, et in *unum* Jesum, juxta Nicæni decretum Concilii?' To which Vigilius, Bishop of Trent, or rather of Tapsus, gives this answer; 'Sed Romæ et antequam Nicæna Synodus conveniret, a temporibus Apostolorum usque ad nunc, ita fidelibus symbolum traditur, nec præjudicant verba ubi sensus incolumis permanet: magis enim cum Domini Jesu Christi sententia hæc fidei professio facit, dicentis, *Creditis in Deum, et in me credite:* nec dixit in *unum* Deum Patrem, et in *unum* meipsum. Quis enim nesciat unum esse Deum, et unum Jesum Christum Filium ejus? *Vigil. lib.* iv. *cont. Eutych.* [§. 1. p. 34.]

57 *R. Chasdai in Or Adonai. R. Joseph Albo in Hikkarim.*

58 'Orientis Ecclesiæ omnes ista tradunt, *Credo in uno Deo Patre omnipotente.' Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 4. p. 18.] 'Bene hæc omnia potuerunt ad solos Hæreticos pertinere, quia falsaverunt Symbolum, dum alter dixerit duos Deos, cum Deus unus sit.' *Optat. lib.* i. *c.* 10. [p. 11.] 'Nos enim et scimus, et legimus, et credimus, et tenemus, unum esse Deum, qui fecit cœlum pariter ac terram, quoniam nec alterum novimus, nec nosse, cum nullus sit, aliquando poterimus.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 30. [p. 728 D.] And before all these Irenæus, citing, under the title of Scripture, a passage out of the book of Hermas called Pastor; 'Bene ergo pronuntiavit Scriptura, Primo omnium crede quoniam unus est Deus, qui omnia constituit et consummavit, et fecit ex eo quod non erat, ut essent omnia, omnium capax, et qui a nemine capiatur.' *Lib.* iv. *cap.* 37. [iv. 20, 2. p. 253.]*

59 *Euseb. in Præp. Evang.* [lib. xi. c. 13.] The passage is yet extant in the epistles of Plato. [Ep. xiii. p. 363.]

* [It is probable, that the early creeds asserted the unity of God against the Gnostics, who believed in two or more coeternal Principles, or did not allow the supreme God to be the Creator. See King on the Creed, p. 61. ed. 5.]

the Law, so the Gospel teacheth us the same, *We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one.* 1 Cor. viii. 4.

This Unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods than one, as that there should be none; which will clearly be demonstrated, first, out of the nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and, secondly, from the government as he is Lord, in which we must not admit confusion.

For first, the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and original cause of all things, as an independent Being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or final cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are inimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings than one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself: *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.* Isai. xlviii. 12. And from this primity he challengeth his Unity; *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.* Isai. xliv. 6.

Again, if there were more Gods than one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently and virtually, for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledge God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable
24 which are simply such must be contained formally, and all others which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments brought from the infinite perfections of the divine nature able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme dominion sufficient to persuade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedom doth he govern and dispose of all things. *He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth,* said Nebuchadnezzar out of his experience; and St. Paul expresseth him as *working all things after the counsel of his own will.* Dan. iv. 35. Eph. i. 11. If then there were more supreme Governors of the World than one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, than which nothing can be more prejudicial unto government. God is a God of order, not confusion; and therefore of unity, not

admitting multiplication. If it be better that the Universe[60] should be governed by one than many, we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God, but what is best. He therefore who made all things, by that right is Lord of all, and because all power is his[61], he alone ruleth over all.

Now God is not only one, but hath an unity peculiar to himself[62], by which he is the only God; and that not only by way of actuality, but also of possibility. Every individual man is one, but so as there is a second and a third, and consequently every one is part of a number, and concurring to a multitude. The Sun indeed is one; so as there is neither third nor second sun, at least within the same vortex: but though there be not, yet there might have been; neither in the unity of the solar nature is there any repugnancy to plurality; for that God which made this World, and in this *the sun to rule the day*, might have made another world by the same fecundity of his omnipotency, and another sun to rule in that. Whereas in the Divine Nature there is an intrinsical and essential singularity, because no other Being can have any existence but from that; and whatsoever essence hath its existence from another is not God. *I am the Lord*, saith he, *and there is none else, there is no God besides me: that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none*

Isa. xlv. 5, 6. Deut. iv. 35. & xxxii. 39. Psal. xviii. 31.

60 Τὰ ὄντα οὐ βούλεται πολιτεύεσθαι κακῶς·
Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος.
Aristot. Metaph. lib. xii. *cap. ult.* [lib. xi. c. 10. §. 14.]

61 'Unus omnium Dominus est Deus: neque enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortem, cum sola omnem teneat potestatem.' *S. Cyprian. de Idol. Vanit.* [p. 227.]

'Quod autem diximus, Orientis Ecclesias tradere unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universitate: verbi gratia, si quis dicit unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit; potest enim et alius homo esse, et tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus vel tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri, sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur, ut alius vel tertius addi non possit; unus est enim sol: multo magis ergo Deus cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri, sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicatur, quod alius non sit.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 5. p. ccii.]

62 אלוה זה אחד הוא ואינו לא שנים ולא יותר על שנים אלא אחד שאין כייחודה אחד מן האחדים הנמצאים בעולם לא אחד במין שהוא כולל אחדים הרבה ולא אחד בגוף שהוא נחלק למחלקות ולקצוות אלא אחד שאין ייחוד אחד כמותו בעולם: *God is one, not two, or more than two, but only one: whose unity is not like to that of the individuals of this world. neither is he one by way of species comprehending many individuals, neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes: but he is so one, as no unity like his is to be found in the world. Moses Maimon. de Fundam. Legis, cap.* 1, 4.

else. He who hath infinite knowledge knoweth no other God beside himself. *Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God, I know not any.* And we who believe in him, and desire to enjoy him, need for that end to know no other God but him: *For this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God;* as certainly *One*[63], as *God.* Isa. xlv. 18, 21, 22. & xliv. 8. John xvii. 3.

It is necessary thus to believe the Unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious subjection, we may learn to know whose that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our minds should wander and fluctuate in our worship about various and uncertain objects. If we should apprehend more Gods than one, I know not what could determinate us in any instant to the actual adoration of any one: for where no difference doth appear, (as, if there were many, and all by nature Gods, there could be none,) what inclination could we have, what reason could we imagine, to prefer or elect any one before the rest for the object of our devotions? Thus is it necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of us who are obliged to worship him.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of him who is to be worshipped. Without this acknowledgment we cannot give unto God the things which are God's, it being part of the worship and honour due unto God, to accept of no compartner with him. When the Law was given, in the observance whereof the religion of the Israelites consisted, the first precept was this prohibition, *Thou shalt have no other gods before me;* and whosoever violateth this, denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the Jews[64] observe. This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God only, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;* because he alone is God: him only shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him only shalt thou trust, because *he only is our rock* Exod. xx. 3. Matt. iv. 10. Ps. lxii. 2.

63 'Veritas Christiana districte pronunciavit, *Deus, si non unus est, non est;* quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcunque non ita fuerit ut esse debebit.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [p. 366 D.] 'Deus cum summum magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronunciavit, *Deus, si non unus est, non est.* Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicendo, si non unus, non est; sed quia, quem confidimus esse, id eum definiamus esse, quod si non est, Deus non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro, summum magnum unicum sit necesse est; ergo et Deus unicus erit; non aliter Deus, nisi summum magnum; nec aliter summum magnum, nisi parem non habens; nec aliter parem non habens, nisi unicus fuerit.' *Ibid.* [p. 367 A.]

64 *Moses Maimon. de Fundam. Legis, cap.* 1, 3.

and our salvation; to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions,
2 Chron. vi. 30. because *he only knoweth the hearts of the children of men.* Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is entirely required of
Deut. vi. 4, 5. him, and engaged to him. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God. And* (or rather, *Therefore*) *thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.* Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not choose but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness; and therefore if there were more so Gods than one, our love must necessarily be terminated unto more than one[65], and consequently divided between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof, our cheerful and ready obedience, which, like the child propounded to the judgment of Solomon, as soon as it is divided, is
Matt. vi. 24. destroyed. *No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other: or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other.*

Having thus described the first notion of a God, having demonstrated the Existence and Unity of that God, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the Article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he says when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in God;* which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus expressed.

Rom. i. 20. Forasmuch as by all things created is made known the *eternal power and Godhead,* and the dependency of all limited beings infers an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universal and overruling wisdom; being this collection is so evident, that all the nations of the earth have made it; being God hath not only written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his Deity by most infallible predictions and supernatural operations; 26

65 'Numerus divinitatis summa ratione constare deberet, vel quoniam et cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur. Ecce enim duos intuens Deos, tam pares quam duo summa magna, quid facerem si ambos colerem? vererer ne abundantia officii superstitio potius quam religio existimaretur; quia duos tam pares et in altero ambos possem in uno demereri; hoc ipsum testimonio præstans parilitati et unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero venerarer, dum in uno mihi duo sunt.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 5. [p. 368 A.]

therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly profess this truth, that *there is a God.*

Again, being a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God; being the entire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the Universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this Unity, or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God.*

I believe in God the Father.

AFTER the confession of a Deity, and assertion of the Divine Unity, the next consideration is concerning God's Paternity; for that *one God is Father of all,* and *to us there is but one God, the Father.* Eph. iv. 6. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Now, although the Christian notion of the divine Paternity be some way peculiar to the evangelical patefaction; yet wheresoever[66] God hath been acknowledged, he hath been understood and worshipped as a Father: the very Heathen Poets[67] so describe their gods, and their vulgar names did carry Father in them[68], as the most popular and universal notion.

This name of Father is a relative; and the proper foundation of Paternity, as of a relation, is Generation. As therefore the phrase of generating is diversely attributed unto several acts, of the same nature with generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it: so the title of Father is given unto divers persons or things, and for several reasons unto the same

66 'Omnem Deum, qui ab homine colitur, necesse est inter solennes ritus et precationes Patrem nuncupari; non tantum honoris gratia, verum etiam rationis, quod et antiquior est homine, et quod vitam, salutem, victum præstat, ut pater. Itaque et Jupiter a precantibus Pater vocatur, et Saturnus, et Janus, et Liber, et cæteri deinceps.' *Lactant. de ver. Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 3. [vol. i. p. 249.]

67 That so frequent in Homer, Πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. 'Eundemque appellans dicit Ennius, Divumque hominumque pater rex.' *Var. de Ling. Lat. lib.* iv. [lib. v. p. 71.] As Servius observes of Virgil, 'A Poeta pene omnibus Diis nomen paternum additur, ut fiant venerabiliores.' And before him Lucilius;

Ut nemo sit nostrum, quin pater optimu' Divum,
Ut Neptunu' Pater, Liber, Saturnu' Pater, Mars,
Janu', Quirinu' Pater nomen dicatur ad unum. Lactant. ibid.

68 As *Jupiter,* which is *Jovis Pater,* or Ζευπάτωρ, otherwise *Diespiter,* or Διϊπάτωρ· and *Marspiter,* of whom Servius, 'Apud Pontifices Marspiter dicitur.' *Æneid. lib.* iii. v. 35. So *Semipater* for *Semo,* [Sancus, the Sabine deity, or Deus Fidius,] and Σαρδοπάτωρ for *Sardus,* the proper deity of Sardinia. *Ptolem.*

Gen. ii. 4. God. *These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens,* saith Moses. So that the creation or production of any thing by which it is, and before it was not, is a kind of generation, and consequently the creator or pro-
Job xxxviii. 28. ducer of it a kind of Father. *Hath the rain a Father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew?* By which words Job signifies, that as there is no other cause assignable of the rain but God, so may he as the cause be called the Father of it, though not in the most proper sense[69], as he is the Father of his Son: and so the Philosophers of old[70], who thought that God did make the world, called him expressly, as the Maker, so the Father
1 Cor. viii. 6. of it. And thus *to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things;* to which the words following in the Creed may seem to have relation, *the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.* But in this mass of Creatures and body of the Universe, some works of the creation more properly call him Father, as being more rightly Sons: such are all the rational and intellectual offspring of the Deity. Of merely natural beings and irrational agents he is the Creator[71]; of rational, as so, the 27
Father also; they are his Creatures, these his Sons. Hence
Heb. xii. 9. he is styled *the Father of Spirits,* and the blessed Angels, when
Job xxxviii. 7. he laid the foundations of the earth, his Sons; *When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy:* hence Man, whom he created after his own image, is called
Acts xvii. 28. his *offspring,* and Adam, the immediate work of his hands, the

69 Ἕτερος γάρ τις ὑετοῦ πατέρα Θεὸν ἀκούει, καὶ ἕτερος υἱοῦ. *Sever. in Job.* [Catena Patrum in Job. c. 26. p. 551.]

70 Plutarch of Plato, calling God πατέρα πάντων καὶ ποιητὴν, says, Τῇ μεταφορᾷ χρώμενος, ὥσπερ εἴωθε, τὸν αἴτιον πατέρα τοῦ κόσμου κέκληκε. *Platon. Quæst.* [ii. tom. v. p. 1000 F.] And Alcimus, Πατὴρ δέ ἐστι τῷ αἴτιος εἶναι πάντων.

71 So Plutarch answers the question, why Plato terms God the Maker and Father of all things? Ἡ τῶν μὲν Θεῶν τῶν γεννητῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πατήρ ἐστι·—ποιητὴς δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων καὶ ἀψύχων. *Father of Gods and men, Maker of things inanimate and irrational.* Οὐ γὰρ χορίου φησὶ Χρύσιππος πατέρα καλεῖσθαι τὸν παρασχόντα τὸ σπέρμα, καίπερ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος γεγονότος. *Non enim agri pater, si Chrysippo credimus, is dicitur qui eum consevit, quanquam e semine deinde fruges nascantur:* as the Latin translation most absurdly. [Ibid.] For there is neither corn, nor field, nor any seed belonging to them in the words of Plutarch. But χόριον (not χωρίον) is the *secunda**, the coat (or rather coats in the acception of Chrysippus, and the language of those times) in which the fœtus is involved in the mother's womb. Though therefore both the secunda and the fœtus be made of the seed of the male in the philosophy of Chrysippus, yet he is not called the Father of the after-birth, but of the child; the one being endued with life and reason, and the other not.

* [It is so in Wyttenbach's edition.]

Son of God: hence may we all cry out with the Israelites taught by the Prophet so to speak, *Have we not all one Father; hath not one God created us?* Thus the first and most universal notion of God's Paternity, in a borrowed or metaphorical sense, is founded rather upon Creation than Procreation. Luke iii. 38. Malac. ii. 10.

Unto this act of Creation is annexed that of Conservation, by which God doth uphold and preserve in being that which at first he made, and to which he gave its being. As therefore it is the duty of the parent to educate and preserve the child, as that which had its being from him; so this paternal education doth give the name of Father[72] unto man, and conservation gives the same to God.

Again, Redemption from a state of misery, by which a people hath become worse than nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of Generation, which joined with love, care, and indulgence in the Redeemer, is sufficient to found a new Paternity, and give him another title of a Father. Well might Moses tell the people of Israel, now brought out of the land of Egypt from their brick and straw, unto their quails and manna, unto their milk and honey, *Is not he thy father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?* Well might God speak unto the same people as to *his Son, even his first-born, Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb; Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb.* And just is the acknowledgment made by that people instructed by the Prophet, *Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, from everlasting is thy name.* And thus another kind of paternal relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a restitution or temporal redemption. Deut. xxxii. 6. Exod. iv. 22. Isa. xliv. 24. xlvi. 3. Isa. lxiii. 16.

Besides, if to be born causeth a relation to a Father, then to be born again maketh an addition of another: and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a Paternity. Now though we cannot *enter the second time into our mother's womb,* nor pass through the same door into the scene of life again; yet we believe and are persuaded, that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.* A double birth there is, and the

72 So Eustathius observes out of an ingenious Etymologist: Πατὴρ Θεὸς μὲν ὡς τὸ πᾶν τηρῶν· ἄνθρωπος δὲ ὡς τοὺς παῖδας τηρῶν. *Il.* θ. [Odyss. θ. 480.]

world consists of two, the first and the second man[73]. And though the incorruptible seed be the Word of God, and the dispensers of it in some sense may say, as St. Paul spake unto
1 Cor. iv. 15. the Corinthians, *I have begotten you through the Gospel:* yet he
Jam. i. 17, 18. is the true Father, whose word it is, and that is God, even
1 John v. 1. *the Father of lights, who of his own will begat us with the word of truth.* Thus *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God;* which Regeneration is as it were a second Creation;
Ephes. ii. 10. *for we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.* And he alone who did create us out of nothing, can 28
beget us again, and make us of the new creation. When Rachel
Gen. xxx. 1, 2. called to Jacob, *Give me children, or else I die;* he answered her sufficiently with this question, *Am I in God's stead?* And if he only openeth the womb, who else can make the Soul[74] to bear? Hence hath he the name of Father, and they of Sons, who are born of him; and so from that internal act of spiritual Regeneration another title of Paternity redoundeth unto the Divinity.

Nor is this the only second birth or sole Regeneration in a Christian sense; the Soul, which after its natural being requires
Matt. xix. 28. a birth into the life of Grace, is also after that born again into a life of Glory. Our Saviour puts us in mind of *the Regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory.* The resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entering upon immortality, a nativity into
Luke xx. 35, 36. another life. For *they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection;* and then as sons, *they become*
Rom. viii. 17. *heirs, co-heirs with Christ, receiving the promise and reward of*
Col. iii. 24. *eternal inheritance. Beloved, now we are the sons of God,* saith
Heb. ix. 15. St. John, even in this life by regeneration, *and it doth not yet*
1 John iii. 2. *appear,* or, *it hath not been yet made manifest*[75], *what we shall be; but we know, that if he appear, we shall be like him;* the manifestation of the Father being a sufficient declaration of the condition of the sons, when the sonship itself consisteth
1 Pet. i. 3, 4. in a similitude of the Father. And, *Blessed be the God and*

[73] 'Totum hominum genus quodammodo sunt homines duo, primus et secundus.' *Prosp.* [lib. Sententiarum ex Augustino, sent. 301. (al. 299). vol. i. p. 313.]

[74] Οὐ γὰρ ἀντὶ Θεοῦ ἐγώ εἰμι τοῦ μόνου δυναμένου τὰς ψυχὰς μήτρας ἀνοιγνύναι, καὶ σπείρειν ἐν αὐταῖς ἀρετὰς, καὶ ποιεῖν ἐγκύμονας καὶ τικτούσας τὰ καλά. *Philo de Alleg.* [lib. iii. vol. i. p. 122.]

[75] 1 John iii. 2. Καὶ οὔπω ἐφανερώθη.

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. Why may not then a second kind of regeneration be thought a fit addition of this paternal relation?

Neither is there only a natural, but also a voluntary and civil foundation of Paternity; for the laws have found a way by which a man may become a father without procreation: and this imitation of nature is called adoption[76], taken in the general signification[77]. Although therefore many ways God be a Father, yet lest any way might seem to exclude us from being his sons, he hath made us so also by adoption. Others are wont to fly to this, as to a comfort of their solitary condition, when either nature[78] hath denied them, or death bereft them of their offspring. Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our sakes; nor is the advantage his, but ours. *Behold what manner* 1 John iii. 1. *of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God;* that we, the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by adoption; that we, who were aliens, strangers, and enemies, should be assumed *unto* Eph. iii. 14, 15. *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all the family*[79] *in heaven and earth is named,* and be made partakers of *the* Eph. i. 18. *riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.* For as in the legal adoption, the father hath as full and absolute[80] power over

76 'Adoptio naturæ similitudo est, ut aliquis filium habere possit, quem non generavit.' *Caii Inst.* i. *tit.* 5. §. 1. Τί ἐστιν υἱοθεσία; νομίμη πρᾶξις μιμουμένη τὴν φύσιν πρὸς ἀπαίδων παραμυθίαν ἐπινενοημένη. *Theoph. Inst.* i. tit. 11.

77 Ἡ υἱοθεσία Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ λέγεται ἀδοπτίων· αὕτη οὖσα γενικὸν ὄνομα εἰς δύω διαιρεῖται, εἰς ἀδρογατιόνα, καὶ τὴν ὁμώνυμον ἀδοπτιόνα. *Theoph. ibid.*

78 'Spadones autem qui generare non possunt, adoptare possunt: et licet filios generare non possint, quos adoptaverunt filios habere possunt.' *Caii Inst.* i. *tit.* 5. §. 4. 'Hi qui generare non possunt, velut spado, utroque modo possunt adoptare. Idem juris est in cœlibe.' *Ulpian. tit.* 9. §. 5. Τυχὸν οὐκ ἔχων τις παῖδας διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ γάμων, ἢ ἐλθεῖν μὲν, μὴ παιδοποιῆσαι δὲ, ἢ παιδυποιῆσαι μὲν, ἀποβάλεσθαι δὲ τούτους, τὸ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ἐλάττωμα, ἢ καὶ τὸ συμβὰν δυστύχημα βουλόμενος ἐπικουφίσαι, ἔλαβεν εἰς υἱοθεσίαν τινά. *Theoph. Inst.* i. *tit.* 11. Τοῖς ἀτυχοῦσιν ἀπαιδίαν λύειν βουλόμενος τὸ δυστύχημα νόμος υἱοθετεῖσθαι προστάσσει, καὶ γνώμῃ ἐκεῖνο κτᾶσθαι, ὃ μὴ εὔπορον λαβεῖν παρὰ τῆς φύσεως. *Leonis Novel.* 27.

79 'In alienam familiam transitus,' is the description in *A. Gell. lib.* v. 19. 'Cum in alienam familiam inque liberorum locum extranei sumuntur, aut per prætorem fit, aut per populum: quod per prætorem fit, adoptatio dicitur; quod per populum, arrogatio.' *Ibid.*

80 As appears out of the form of rogation yet extant in this manner: 'Velitis, jubeatis, Quirites, uti Lucius Valerius Lucio Titio tam jure legeque

his adopted son, as over his own issue; so in the spiritual, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. 29
Eph. i. 5. He then who hath *predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself*, hath thereby another kind of paternal
Rom. viii. 15. relation, and so we receive the *Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.*

The necessity of this faith in God as in our Father appeareth, first, in that it is the ground of all our filial fear, honour, and
Eph. vi. 1, 2. obedience due unto him upon this relation. *Honour thy father, is the first commandment with promise*, written in tables of stone with the finger of God; and, *Children, obey your parents in the Lord*, is an evangelical precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; *for this is right*, saith St. Paul. And if there be such a rational and legal obligation of honour and obedience to the *fathers of our flesh*, how much more must we think ourselves obliged to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and
Mal. i. 6. everlasting Father! *A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is my honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts.* If we be heirs, we must be co-heirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the only-begotten; but being he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as do the same; as he hath said,
Matt. xii. 50. *Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother.* If it be required of a bishop in the church
1 Tim. iii. 4. of God, to be *one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;* what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid, unto the father of the family!

The same relation in the object of our faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that
Luke xi. 2. he cannot help us; but comprehended all in this relation, *When ye pray, say, Our Father.* This prevents all *vain repetitions* of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all
Matt. vi. 8. tautology, for *our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him.* This creates a clear assurance of a grant

filius sibi siet, quam si ex eo patre matreque familias ejus natus esset, utique ei vitæ necisque in eo potestas siet, uti patri endo filio est?' *Ibid.*

without mistake of our petition: *What man is there of us, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will give him a serpent*[81]*? If we then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts unto our children, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him!* Matt. vii. 9, 10, 11.

Again, this Paternity is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetening all afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections[82]. *We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?* especially considering, that *they chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness:* they, as an argument of their authority; he, as an assurance of his love; they, that we might acknowledge them to be our parents; he, that he may persuade us that we are his sons: *For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.* And what greater incitement unto the exercise of patience is imaginable unto a suffering soul, than to see in every stroke the hand of a Father, in every affliction a demonstration of his love? Or how canst thou repine, or be guilty of the least degree of impatiency, even in the sharpest corrections, if *thou shalt know with thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee?* How canst thou not be comforted, and even rejoice in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he which striketh pitieth, he which afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? *For like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.* Heb. xii. 9, 10. Heb. xii. 6. Deut. viii. 5. Ps. ciii. 13.

Lastly, the same relation strongly inferreth an absolute necessity of our imitation; it being clearly vain to assume the title of son without any similitude of the Father. What is the general notion of generation but the production of the like[83]; nature, ambitious of perpetuity, striving to preserve the species in the multiplication and succession of individuals? And this similitude consisteth partly in essentials, or the likeness of nature; partly

81 Ἀντὶ πέρκης σκορπίον· παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ χείρω αἱρουμένων ἀντὶ τῶν βελτιόνων. *Zenob.* [Cent. i. n. 88.]

Ὁ δ' ἀντὶ πιτοῦς σκορπίον λαιμῷ σπάσας. *Lycophron. Alex.* v. 476.

82 'Quod si a Domino nonnulla credimus incuti, cui magis patientiam quam Domino præbeamus? Quin insuper gratulari et gaudere nos docet dignatione divinæ castigationis. *Ego*, inquit, *quos diligo castigo.* O servum illum beatum, cujus emendationi Dominus instat! cui dignatur irasci, quem admonendi dissimulatione non decipit.' *Tertul. de Patientia*, [c. 11. p. 146 B.]

83 Πᾶν τὸ γεννῶν ὅμοιον ἑαυτῷ γεννᾷ. *Epiph. Hær.* lxxvi. §. 6. [vol. i. p. 918 D.]

Gen. v. 3. in accidentals, or the likeness in figure[84] or affections[85]. *Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image:* and can we imagine those the sons of God which are no way like him? a similitude of nature we must not, of figure we cannot pretend unto: it remains then only that we bear some likeness in our Eph. v. 1. actions and affections. *Be ye therefore followers,* saith the Apostle, or rather imitators[86] *of God, as dear children.* What he hath revealed of himself, that we must express within ourselves. Thus God spake unto the children of Israel, whom he styled his Lev. xi. 44. xix. 2. xx. 7. 1 Pet. i. 15. Son, *Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.* And the Apostle upon the same ground speaketh unto us, as to *obedient children, As he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.* It is part of the general beneficence and universal goodness of Matt. v. 44, 45. Vide S. August. in Psalm c. our God, that *he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* These impartial beams and undistinguishing showers are but to shew us what we ought to do, and to make us fruitful in the works of God; for no other reason Christ hath given us this command, *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven*[87]. No other command did he give upon this ground, Luke vi. 36. but, *Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful.*

So necessary is this faith in God, as in our Father, both for direction to the best of actions, and for consolation in the worst of conditions.

But although this be very necessary, yet is it not the principal or most proper explication of God's paternity. For as we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God, so must we look upon God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of John xx. 17. that Son. *I ascend unto my Father, and your Father*[88], saith our

84 Τὸ ὅμοια γίγνεσθαι τοῖς γεννήσασι τὰ ἔκγονα, εὔλογον. *Aristot. de Generat. Animal. lib.* i. *cap.* 19. §. 5.

85 *Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis:*
Est in juvencis, est in equis patrum
Virtus, neque imbellem feroces
Progenerant aquilæ columbam.
Hor. Carm. iv. 4. 29.

86 Ephes. v. 1. Μιμηταί. 'Filii hominum sunt quando male faciunt; quando bene, filii mei (Dei).' *S. August. in Psal.* lii. [vol. iv. p. 489 G.]

87 'Similitudinem patris actus indicent sobolis; similitudo operis similitudinem indicet generis: actus nomen confirmet, ut nomen genus demonstret. *August. de Temp. Serm.* 76. [Serm. 312. §. 2. vol. v. App. p. 524 G.]

88 Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν. Had πατέρα in both places had its article, there would have seemed two Fathers: had the article been prefixed to πατέρα ὑμῶν, he would have seemed first ours, then Christ's: but being prefixed to πατέρα μου, it shews God to be principally and originally Christ's, and by our reference unto him, our Father. Πατέρα μου μὲν κατὰ φύσιν

Saviour; the same of both, but in a different manner, denoted by the article prefixed before the one, and not the other: which distinction in the original we may preserve by this translation, *I ascend unto the Father of me, and Father of you;* first *of me,* and then *of you:* not therefore his, because ours; but therefore ours, because his. So far we are the sons of God, as we are like unto him; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likeness of his Son. *For whom he did foreknow,* Rom. viii. *he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son,* 29. *that he might be the first-born among many brethren.* He the first-born, and we sons, as brethren unto him: he *appointed heir of* Heb. i. 2. *all things,* and we *heirs of God, as joint-heirs with him.* Thus Rom. viii. God *sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons*[89]. 17. Gal. iv. 4, And *because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son* 5, 6. *into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* By his mission are we
31 adopted, and by his Spirit call we God *our Father.* So are we no longer *servants, but* now *sons; and if sons, then heirs of God,* Gal. iv. 7. but still *through Christ.* It is true indeed, that *both he that* Heb. ii. 11. *sanctifieth,* that is, Christ, *and they who are sanctified,* that is, faithful Christians, *are all of one,* the same Father, the same God; *for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren:* yet are they not all of him after the same manner[90], not the *many sons* like the *Captain of their salvation:* but Christ the beloved, Heb. ii. 10. the first-born, the only-begotten, the Son after a more peculiar and more excellent manner; the rest with relation unto, and dependence on his sonship; as given unto him: *Behold I, and* Isa. viii. 18. *the children which God hath given me:* as being so by faith in Heb. ii. 13. him; *For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus:* Gal. iii. 26. as receiving the right of sonship from him; *For as many as* John i. 12. *received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.*

ἐν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, διὰ χάριν δι' ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ υἱοθεσίᾳ. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxix. §. 55. [vol. i. p. 778 C.] Οὐκ εἰπὼν, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ διελὼν, καὶ εἰπὼν πρῶτον τὸ οἰκεῖον, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, ὅπερ ἦν κατὰ φύσιν· εἶτ' ἐπαναγαγὼν, καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, ὅπερ ἦν κατὰ θέσιν. *S. Cyril. Catech.* vii. [c. 7. p. 116 A.] Ἕτερος οὖν αὐτοῦ πατὴρ, καὶ ἕτερος ὑμῶν; πάνυ μὲν οὖν. Εἰ γὰρ τῶν δικαίων ἕτερος Θεὸς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν. Ἐπειδὰν γὰρ εἶπε, Εἰπὲ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ τούτου ἴσον τι φαντασθῶσι, δείκνυσι τὸ ἐνηλλαγμένον. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. 86. vol. viii. p. 515 C.]

89 'Hoc facit Deus ex filiis hominum filios Dei, quia ex filio Dei fecit filium hominis.' *S. August. in Psal.* lii. [§. 6. vol. iv. p. 489 G.]

90 'Dicimur et filii Dei, sed ille aliter filius Dei.' *S. August. in Psal.* lxxxviii. [Serm. i. §. 7. vol. iv. p. 939 F.] Ἔστι τοίνυν ὁ Θεὸς πολλῶν μὲν καταχρηστικῶς πατὴρ, ἑνὸς δὲ μόνου φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ. *S. Cyril. Catech.* vii. [c. 5. p. 114 D.]

Among all the sons of God there is none like to that one Son of God[91]. And if there be so great a disparity in the filiation, we must make as great a difference in the correspondent relation. There is one degree of sonship founded on creation, and that is the lowest, as belonging unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that there is grounded upon regeneration, or adoption, belonging only to the truly faithful in this life: and a third above the rest founded on the resurrection, or collation of the eternal inheritance, and the similitude of God, appertaining to the saints alone in the world to come: For *we are now the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him.* And there is yet another degree of filiation, of a greater eminency and a different nature, appertaining properly to none of these, but to the true Son of God alone, who amongst all his brethren hath only received the title of his *own son*[92], and a singular testimony from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son*, even[93] in the presence of John the Baptist, even in the midst of Moses and Elias, (who are certainly the sons of God by all the other three degrees of filiation,) and therefore hath called God after a peculiar way *his own Father.* And so at last we come unto the most singular and eminent paternal relation, *unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore;* the Father of him, and of us, but not the Father of us as of him[94].

1 John iii. 2.

Rom. viii. 32. Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. John v. 18. πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν, as Rom. viii. 32. ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο. 2 Cor. xi. 31.

91 'Ergo nemo in filiis Dei similis erit filio Dei. Et ipse dictus est filius Dei, et nos dicti sumus filii Dei: sed *quis erit similis Domino in filiis Dei?* Ille unicus, nos multi: ille unus, nos in illo unum: ille natus, nos adoptati: ille ab æterno filius unigenitus ['genitus' in the Benedictine edition] per naturam, nos a tempore facti per gratiam.' *S. August. in Psal.* lxxxviii. [Serm. i. §. 7. vol. iv. p. 939 E.]

92 'Ut magnificentia Dei dilectionis ex comparationis genere nosceretur, non pepercisse Deum proprio filio suo docuit: non utique pro adoptandis adoptato, neque pro creatis creaturæ: sed pro alienis suo, pro connuncupandis proprio.' *Hilar. de Trin. lib.* vi. *cap.* 45. [p. 909 D.]

93 'Anne tibi in eo quod dicitur, *Hic est*, non hoc significari videtur, Alios quidem cognominatos ab eo in filios, sed hic filius meus est; Donavi adoptionis plurimis nomen, sed iste mihi filius est? *Idem, de Trin. lib.* vi. *cap.* 23. [p. 893 D.]

94 'Non sicut Christi pater, ita et noster pater. Nunquam enim Christus ita nos conjunxit, ut nullam distinctionem faceret inter nos et se. Ille enim filius æqualis patri, ille æternus cum patre, patrique coæternus: nos autem facti per filium, adoptati per unicum. Proinde nunquam auditum est de ore Domini nostri Jesu Christi, cum ad discipulos loqueretur, dixisse illum de Deo summo patre suo, Pater noster; sed, aut Pater meus dixit, aut Pater vester; Pater noster, non dixit, usque adeo ut quodam loco poneret hæc duo: *Vado ad Deum meum*, inquit, *et Deum vestrum.* Quare non dixit, Deum nostrum? et Patrem meum dixit, et Patrem vestrum; non dixit, Patrem nostrum? Sic jungit ut distinguat, sic distinguit ut

Christ hath taught us to say, *Our Father:* a form of speech which he never used himself; sometimes he calls him *the Father;* sometimes *my Father*, sometimes *your*, but never *our:* he makes no such conjunction of us to himself, as to make no distinction between us and himself; so conjoining us as to distinguish, though so distinguishing as not to separate us.

Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of God's Paternity, so to be the original and proper explication of this Article of the Creed: and that not only because the ancient fathers deliver no other exposition of it; but also because that which I conceive to be the first occasion, rise, and original of the Creed itself, requireth this as the proper interpretation. Immediately before the ascension of our Saviour, he said unto his Apostles, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* Mat.xxviii. 18, 19.
32 *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* From this sacred form of Baptism did the Church derive the rule of Faith[95], requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their name. When the Eunuch asked Philip, *What doth hinder me to be baptized? Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest:* and when the Eunuch replied, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; he baptized him.* And before that, the Samaritans, *when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women.* For as in the Acts of the Apostles there is no more expressed Acts viii. 36, 37, 38. Acts viii. 12.

non sejungat. Unum nos vult esse in se, unum autem Patrem et se.' *S. August. in Joan. Tract.* 21. [§. 3. vol. iii. part. 2. p. 457 B.]

95 Arius and Euzoius, in their Creed delivered to Constantine: Ταύτην τὴν πίστιν παρειλήφαμεν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων εὐαγγελίων, λέγοντος τοῦ κυρίου τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. *Socrat. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [p. 61]. And upon the exhibiting this Confession of Faith, they were restored to the communion of the Church by the Synod of Jerusalem. *Sozomen. lib.* ii. *cap.* 27. [p. 84.] In the same manner Eusebius delivered his Creed unto the Council of Nice, concluding and deducing it from the same text, Καθὼς καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς, εἶπε· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε, &c. *Socrat. lib.* i. *cap.* 8. [p. 23.] *Theodoret. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 38.] The same is also alleged by the Council of Antioch, under the Emperor Constantius and Pope Julius. *Socrat. lib.* ii. *cap.* 10. *Vide S. Athanas. in Epist. ad ubique Orthod. Orat. cont. Gregales Sabellii, et cont. Arianos, ex Deo Deus.* [vol. ii. p. 583.] *Vide Basil. de Sp. Sanct.* So Vigilius Tapsensis, *Dial. lib.* i. [c. 5. p. 88.] makes Arius and Athanasius jointly speak these words; 'Credimus in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum, et in Spiritum Sanctum. Hæc est fidei nostræ regula, quam cœlesti magisterio Dominus tradidit Apostolis, dicens, Ite, baptizate, &c.'

Acts ii. 38. viii. 16. x. 48. xix. 5. than that they baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ:* so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, than to believe in the same name. But being the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain that from the Apostles' times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the Eunuch said not simply, I believe in the Son, but *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, as a brief explication of that part of the institution which he had learned before of Philip: so they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught, not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easy, and familiar way; which when they had rendered, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being regularly and constantly used, made up the rule of Faith, that is, the Creed. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any, who shall seriously consider the constant practice of the Church, from the first age unto this present, of delivering the rule of Faith to those which were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves, or their sureties, an express recitation, profession, or acknowledgment of the Creed. From whence this observation is properly deducible; That in what sense the name of *Father* is taken in the form of Baptism, in the same it also ought to be taken in this Article. And being nothing can be more clear than that, when it is said, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son,* the notion of Father hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joined with his: and as we are baptized into no other Son of that Father, but that only-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the Father of that only-begotten: it followeth, that the proper explication of the first words of the Creed is this: *I believe in God the Father of Christ Jesus.*

In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the Creed, whereby the Father is considered both personally and essentially: personally, as the first in the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father is evident, not only out of the original, or occasion, but also from the

very letter of the Creed, which teacheth us *to believe in God the Father, and in his Son;* for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father of himself. As therefore when I say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his Son,* I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first
33 Article; so when I said, *I believe in God the Father,* I must as necessarily be understood of the Father[96] of him, whom I call *his Son* in the second Article.

Now as it cannot be denied that God may several ways be said to be the Father of Christ; first, as he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; secondly, as he was sent by him with special authority, as the king of Israel; thirdly, as he was raised from the dead, out of the womb of the earth unto immortal life, and made heir of all things in his Father's house: so must we not doubt but, beside all these, God is the Father of that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was with God, and God: which shall be demonstrated fully in the second Article, when we come to shew how Christ is the only-begotten Son. And according unto this paternity by way of generation totally Divine, in which he who begetteth is God, and he which is begotten, the same God, do we believe in God, as the eternal Father of an eternal Son. Which relation is coeval with his essence: so that we are not to imagine one without the other; but as we profess him always God, so must we acknowledge him always Father[97], and that in a far more proper manner than the same title can be given to any creature[98]. Such is the fluctuant condition of human generation,

Luke i. 35. John x. 35, 36. i. 49, 50.

Acts xiii. 32, 33.

John i. 1.

96 'Pater cum audis, Filii intellige Patrem, qui filius supradictæ sit imago substantiæ.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 4. p. cci.]

97 Ἅμα γάρ ἐστι Θεὸς καὶ ἅμα πατήρ· οὐχ ὑστερίζουσαν ἔχων τοῦ εἶναι τὴν γέννησιν, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ τῷ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ ὑφεστὼς καὶ νοούμενος. *S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trin.* 2. [vol. v. p. 457 D.] Πατὴρ ἀεὶ πατὴρ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν καιρὸς ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ πατήρ. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* lxii. §. 3. [vol. i. p. 515 A.] 'Sicut nunquam fuit non Deus, ita nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filius natus.' *Gennad. de Eccles. dogm. cap.* i. [p. 75 A.] 'Credimus in Deum, et eundem confitemur Patrem, ut eundem semper habuisse Filium nos credamus.' *Chrysol. Serm.* 59. [p. 704 E.] 'Inest Deo pietas, est in Deo semper affectio, paternitas permanet apud illum: semper ergo Filium fuisse credas, ne Patrem semper non fuisse blasphemes.' *Idem, Serm.* 62. [p. 707 E.] 'Advertite, quod cum Dei Patris nomen in confessione conjungit, ostendit quod non ante Deus esse cœperit, et postea Pater, sed sine ullo initio et Deus semper et Pater est.' *August. de Temp. Serm.* 132. [Serm. ccxlii. al. 131 de Temp. vol. v. Appendix p. 397 F.]

98 'Deus solus proprie verus est Pater, qui sine initio et fine Pater est; non enim aliquando cœpit esse quod Pater est, sed semper Pater est, semper habens Filium ex se genitum.' *Faustinus, lib. cont. Arianos.* [c. 7. p.

and of those relations which arise from thence, that he which is this day a son, the next may prove a father, and within the space of one day more, without any real alteration in himself, become neither son nor father, losing one relation by the death of him that begot him, and the other by the departure of him that was begotten by him. But in the Godhead these relations are more proper[99], because fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming Father, in reference to the same kind of generation.

A farther reason of the propriety of God's Paternity appears from this, that he hath begotten a Son of the same nature and essence with himself, not only specifically, but individually, as I shall also demonstrate in the exposition of the second Article. For generation being the production of the like, and that likeness being the similitude of substance[1]; where is the nearest identity of nature, there must be also the most proper generation, and consequently he which generateth, the most proper Father. If therefore man, who by the benediction of God given
Gen. i. 28. unto him at his first creation in these words, *Be fruitful and*
Gen. v. 3. *multiply and replenish the earth*, begetteth a son *in his own likeness, after his image*, that is, of the same human nature, of the same substance with him, (which if he did not, he should not according to the benediction multiply himself or man at all,) with which similitude of nature many accidental disparities may consist—if by this act of generation he obtaineth the name of Father, because, and in regard, of the similitude of his nature in the Son, how much more properly must that name belong unto God himself, who hath begotten a Son of a nature and essence so totally like, so totally the same, that no accidental disparity can imaginably consist with that identity!

557 H.] Ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος μόνης ὁ πατὴρ κυρίως πατήρ ἐστι, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κυρίως υἱός ἐστι, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ μόνων ἕστηκε τὸ πατὴρ ἀεὶ πατὴρ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ υἱὸς ἀεὶ υἱὸς εἶναι. *S. Athanas. Disp. cont. Arianos.* [I. 21. vol. i. pt. i. p. 426 C.]

99 Ἐπὶ μόνης τῆς θεότητος τὸ πατὴρ καὶ τὸ υἱὸς ἕστηκε καὶ ἔστιν ἀεί· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων εἰ πατὴρ λέγεταί τις, ἀλλ' ἑτέρου γέγονεν υἱὸς, καὶ εἰ υἱὸς λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἑτέρου λέγεται πατήρ· ὥστε ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὴ σώζεσθαί κυρίως τὸ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ ὄνομα. *S. Athanas. tom.* i. Πατὴρ κυρίως, ὅτι μὴ καὶ υἱός. ὥσπερ καὶ υἱὸς κυρίως, ὅτι μὴ καὶ πατήρ. τὰ γὰρ ἡμέτερα οὐ κυρίως, ὅτι καὶ ἄμφω. *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 35. [*Orat.* xxix. 5. vol. i. p. 526 A.]

1 'Etiamsi Filius hominis homo in quibusdam similis, in quibusdam sit dissimilis Patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est, negari verus Filius non potest, et quia verus est Filius, negari ejusdem substantiæ non potest.' *S. August. lib.* ii. *cont. Max. cap.* 15. [§. 2. vol. viii. p. 711 A.] *Vide Tho. Sum. p.* i. *quæst.* 33. *art.* 2. *ad quart.*

34 That God is the proper and eternal Father of his own eternal Son is now declared: what is the eminency or excellency of this relation followeth to be considered. In general then we may safely observe, that in the very name[2] of Father there is something of eminence which is not in that of Son; and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the first, in respect of him whom we term the second Person; and as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to preserve it[3].

Now that privilege or priority[4] consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other, (for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both;) but only in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he acknowledgeth that he is *from him*, that he *liveth by him*, that the *Father gave him to have life in himself*, and generally referreth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, *The Father is greater than I*[5], of Christ as the Son of God, as the second person in the

John vii. 29. vi. 57. v. 26.

John xiv. 28.

2 Αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς μεῖζόν ἐστι τοῦ υἱοῦ. *Syn. Sardic. Theodoret. lib.* ii. *cap.* 8. [p. 82.] [Mansi iii p. 84 E.] 'Insinuatur nobis in Patre auctoritas, in filio nativitas.' *S. August.*

3 Τῷ μὲν ἀγεννήτῳ πατρὶ οἰκεῖον ἀξίωμα φυλακτέον, μηδένα τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ τὸν αἴτιον λέγοντας. *Alex. apud Theodoret. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [p. 19.]

4 Ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν τῶν αἰτίων πρὸς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν σχέσιν, προτετάχθαι τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸν πατέρα φαμὲν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς φύσεως διαφορὰν οὐκέτι. *S. Basil. cont. Eunom. lib.* i. [§. 20. vol. i. p. 232 B.]

5 Μείζων, εἶπεν, οὐ μεγέθει τινὶ οὐδὲ χρόνῳ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς γέννησιν. *S. Athanas. cont. Arianos, lib.* ii. [I. 58. vol. i. p. 462 E.] Λείπεται τοίνυν κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον ἐνταῦθα τὸ μεῖζον λέγεσθαι. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχὴ τῷ υἱῷ, κατὰ τοῦτο μείζων ὁ πατὴρ, ὡς αἴτιος καὶ ἀρχή. διὸ καὶ ὁ κύριος οὕτως εἶπεν, Ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστί, καθὸ πατὴρ δηλονότι. τὸ δὲ πατὴρ τί ἄλλο σημαίνει, ἢ οὐχὶ τὸ αἰτία εἶναι καὶ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντος; *S. Basil. cont. Eunom. lib.* i. [§. 25. vol. i. p. 236 C.] And the same St. Basil doth not only acknowledge this to be true in respect of the Divine nature of Christ, but thinketh the Divinity of the Son may be proved from hence. Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ δηλοῦσθαι πεπίστευκα· τὰς γὰρ συγκρίσεις οἶδα κυρίως ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως γινομένας· ἄγγελον γὰρ ἀγγέλου λέγομεν μείζονα, καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀνθρώπου δικαιότερον, καὶ πτηνὸν πτηνοῦ ταχύτερον, εἰ τοίνυν αἱ συγκρίσεις ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοειδῶν γίνονται, μείζων δὲ κατὰ σύγκρισιν εἴρηται ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱός. *Ad Cæsarienses Epist.* 141. [Epist. VIII. 5. vol. iii. p. 84 B.] Τὸ μεῖζον μέν ἐστι τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως. *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 36. [Orat. 30. §. 7. vol. i. p. 544 D.] *et Orat.* 40. [§. 43. p. 725 D.] Οὐ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ μεῖζον, κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν δέ. *Vide Epiph. in Ancorato, cap.* 17. [vol. ii. p. 22.] Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις μείζονα εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καθὸ αἴτιος τοῦ υἱοῦ, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀντεροῦμεν. *S. Chrysost. Homil. in Joan.* 75. [vol. viii. p. 443 D.] Ἴσος τοιγαροῦν κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον ὑπάρχων ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα, μείζονα αὐτὸν φησιν ὡς ἄναρχον, ἔχων ἀρχὴν κατὰ μόνον τὸ ἐξ οὗ, εἰ καὶ σύνδρομον αὐτῷ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχοι. *S. Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. cap.* 11. [vol. v. p. 85 E.] And Isidore Pelusiota, *lib.* iii. *Epist.* 334. [p. 386 C.]

blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his essence, but his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who only hath it of himself, and is the original
John v. 30. of all power and essence in the Son. *I can of mine own self do nothing*, saith our Saviour, because he is not of himself[6]; and whosoever receives his being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeni-
John v. 19. ably the same, as in God they are. *The Son* then *can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do*, because he hath no power[7] of himself, but what the Father gave; and being he 35

cites this saying of an ancient Father: Καὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἴσταται ἢ γεννήτωρ, καὶ τὸ ἴσον καθ' ὃ θεὸς καὶ ὁμοούσιος. So Vigilius professes to believe the Son 'æqualem per omnia Patri, excepto eo quod ille ingenitus est, et iste genitus.' *De Trin. lib.* xi. [p. 285.] 'Ideo totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est a seipso, sed a Patre. Æqualis est enim Patri, sed hoc quoque accepit a Patre.' *S. August. Epist.* 66. [Ep. CLXX. 8. vol. ii. p. 610 F.] 'Necesse est quodammodo prior sit, qua Pater sit, quoniam antecedat necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit habens originem, quia nascitur.' *Novatian.* [*de Trin.* c. 31. p. 729 C.] 'Major itaque Pater filio est; et plane major, cui tantum donat esse quantus ipse est, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in formam suam generat.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* ix. *cap.* 54. [p. 1020 E.] 'Non præstantem quenquam cuiquam genere substantiæ, sed subjectum alterum alteri nativitate naturæ: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod pater est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod filius est.' *Idem, de Syn. cont. Arianos. cap.* 64. [p. 1187 D.] 'Quis non Patrem potiorem confitebitur, ut ingenitum a genito, ut Patrem a Filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus sit, ut volentem ab eo qui obediat? Et ipse nobis erit testis, *Pater major me est.*' *Idem, de Trin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 12. [p. 813 E.] 'In eo, quod in sese sunt, Dei ex Deo divinitatem cognosce; in eo vero quod *Pater major est*, confessionem paternæ auctoritatis intellige.' *Idem, lib.* xi. *cap.* 12. [p. 1089 D.] And before all these Alexander Bishop of Alexandria: Τὸ δὲ ἀγέννητον τῷ πατρὶ μόνον ἰδίωμα παρεῖναι δοξάζοντες, ἅτε δὴ καὶ αὐτοῦ, φάσκοντος τοῦ σωτῆρος, Ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστί. *Theodoret. Hist. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [p. 19.] Lastly, we have the testimony of Photius, that many of the ancient Fathers so expounded it: Τὴν, Ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φωνὴν, διαφόρως οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐξειλήφασιν· οἱ μὲν γάρ φασι τῷ αἰτίῳ μείζονα εἰρῆσθαι. *Epist.* 176. [p. 262.] 'Æqualis Patri, sed major Pater, quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia, et causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, ut isto modo sit.' *Victor. Afr. adv. Arium. lib.* i. [p. 193 C.] '*Pater*, inquit, *major me est*; merito major, quia solus hic auctor sine auctore est.' *Phœbadius.* [*contra Arianos.* c. 13. p. 253 A.]

6 'Quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? quia a Patre habet ut filius sit. Quare a Patre habet ut filius sit? quia a Patre habet ut possit: quia a Patre habet ut sit.' *S. August. Tract.* 20. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part. 2. p. 450 D.]

7 'Non alia potentia est in Filio, et alia substantia; sed ipsa est potentia quæ et substantia; substantia ut sit, potentia ut possit. Ergo, quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, *Filius non potest a se facere quicquam*: quia non est Filius a se, ideo non potest a se.' *Ibid.* [p. 450 F.] 'Totum quod est, de Patre est; totum quod potest, de Patre est; quoniam quod potest et est, hoc unum est, et de Patre totum est.' *Ibid.* [§. 8. p. 452 F.] 'Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem: quia de Patre est

gave him all the power, as communicating his entire and undivided essence, therefore *what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise,* by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to any thing than the life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable, that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King,* saith the Prophet Jeremy; and St. Paul putteth the Thessalonians in mind, how they *turned from idols, to serve the living and true God.* Now life is otherwise in God than in the creatures; in him originally, in them derivatively; in him as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependence and participation; our life is in him, but his is in himself; and as *the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*[8]: both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, *as* the one, *so* the other[9];

Jer. x. 10.

1 Thess. i. 9.

John v. 26.

totus Filius, et tota substantia et potentia ejus ex illo est qui genuit eum.' *Idem, Tract.* 21. *in Joan.* [§. 2. p. 456 C.] 'Et primum Filium cognosce, cum dicitur, *Non potest Filius ab se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem.* Habes nativitatem Filii, quæ ab se nihil possit facere nisi videat. In eo autem quod ab se nihil potest, innascibilitatis adimit errorem. Ab se enim non potest posse nativitas.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* vii. *cap.* 21. [p. 929 C.] 'Dum non ab se facit, ad id quod agit secundum nativitatem sibi Pater auctor est.' *Idem, lib.* xi. *cap.* 12. [p. 1089 E.] 'Auctorem discrevit cum ait, *Non potest ab se facere:* obedientiam significat cum addit, *nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem.*' *Idem, de Syn. cap.* 75. [p. 1192 C.]

8 '*Sicut habet Pater vitam in semetipso, sic dedit et Filio vitam habere in semetipso:* ut hoc solum intersit inter Patrem et Filium, quia Pater habet vitam in semetipso quam nemo ei dedit, Filius autem habet vitam in semetipso quam Pater dedit.' *S. August. Tract.* 19. *in Joan.* [§. 11. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 442 C.] 'Incommutabilis est vita Filii, sicut Patris, et tamen de Patre est: et inseparabilis est operatio Patris et Filii; sed tamen ita operari Filio de illo est, de quo ipse est, id est, de Patre.' *Idem, de Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1. [§. 3. vol. viii. p. 773 E.]

9 'Sicut habet dedit, quod habet dedit, qualem habet, talem dedit, quantam habet, tantam dedit.' *Idem, cont. Maximin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 14. [II. 14. 7. vol. viii. p. 706 F.] 'Ergo quod dicitur, *dedit Filio,* tale est ac si diceretur, genuit Filium; generando enim dedit. Quomodo dedit ut esset, sic dedit ut vita esset, et sic dedit ut in semetipso vita esset.' *Idem, Tract.* 22. *in Joan.* [§. 10. vol. iii. part. 2. p. 469 G.] 'Connectitur, tali confessione originis suæ, indiscretæ naturæ perfecta nativitas. Quod enim in utroque vita est, id in utroque significatur essentia; et in vita quæ generatur ex vita, id est, essentia quæ de essentia nascitur, dum non dissimilis nascitur, scilicet quia vita ex vita est, tenet in se originis suæ indissimilem naturam, quia natæ et gignentis essentiæ, id est, vitæ quæ habetur et data est, similitudo non discrepet.' *S. Hilar. de Syn. adv. Arianos.* [c. 16. p. 1160 C.] 'Quia ergo apparet vita Patris hoc esse quod ipse est; sicut habet vitam in se, sic dedit; sic dedit Filio habere vitam, id est, sic est Esse

but only with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son
John vi. 57. receiveth it. From whence he professeth of himself, that *the living Father sent him, and that he liveth by*[10] *the Father.*

We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the darkness of this mystery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father; whose preeminence undeniably consisteth in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himself, and that there is no other person who is God, but is God of him. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some preeminence, where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, he is from none[11]; what the Son is, he is from him:

Filii, sicut Esse Patris.' *Vigil. African. Disp.* [p. 699 G.] 'In vita naturæ et essentiæ significatio est, quæ sicut habetur, ita data esse docetur ad habendum.' *S. Hilar. ibid.* [c. 19. p. 1163 A.]

[10] 'Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quia ex Patre Filius est—propter Patrem, quia eructatum est Verbum ex Patris corde, quia a Patre processit, quia ex paterno generatus est utero, quia fons Pater Filii est, quia radix Pater Filii est.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib.* iv. *cap.* 10. [al. c. 5. §. 126. vol. ii. p. 545 B.]

[11] 'Pater de nullo patre, Filius de Deo Patre: Pater quod est, a nullo est; quod autem Pater est, propter Filium est. Filius vero et quod Filius est, propter Patrem est, et quod est, a Patre est.' *S. August. Tract* 19. *in Joan.* [§. 13. vol. iii. p. 443 D.] 'Filium dicimus Deum de Deo; Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifestum est quod Filius habeat alium de quo sit, et cui Filius sit; Pater autem non Filium de quo sit habeat, sed tantum cui Pater sit. Omnis enim filius de patre est quod est, et patri filius est: nullus autem pater de filio est quod est.' *Idem, de Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1. [§. 2. vol. viii. p. 773 A.] 'Filius non hoc tantum habet nascendo, ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit.' *Ibid, lib.* v. *cap.* 15. [§. 16. p. 841 D.] 'Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsam substantiam nascendo habet.' *Ibid. cap.* 15. [§. 16.] 'Pater non habet Patrem de quo sit, Filius autem de Patre est ut sit, atque ut illi cœternus sit.' *Ibid. lib.* vi. *cap.* 10. [§. 11. p. 850 D.] '*Ab ipso*, inquit, *sum;* quia Filius de Patre, et quicquid est Filius, de illo est cujus est Filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus *Deum de Deo*, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum; et dicimus Dominum Jesum *Lumen de lumine*, Patrem non dicimus Lumen de lumine, sed tantum Lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, *Ab ipso sum.*' *Idem, Tract.* 31. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part. ii. p. 521 F.] 'Pater non est si non habeat Filium, et Filius non est si non habeat Patrem: sed tamen Filius Deus de Patre, Pater autem Deus, sed non de Filio: Pater Filii, non Deus de Filio; ille autem Filius Patris, et Deus de Patre.' *Idem, Tract.* 29. *in Joan.* [§. 5. p. 514 F.] 'Hoc tamen inter Patrem et Filium interest, quia Pater a nullo hoc accepit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Patris accepit.' *Ambros. in Epist. ad Eph. cap.* 2*. 'Est ergo Deus Pater omnium institutor et creator, solus originem nesciens.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 31. [p. 729 C.] Whereas he speaks after of the Son, 'Est ergo Deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitus, ut esset Deus.' [p. 720 B.] 'Pater est Deus de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus.' *S. August. Epist.* 66. [Ep. 170. vol. viii. p. 610 E.]

* [This is not a work of Ambrose: v. Opp. vol. ii. Append. p. 234 F.]

what the first is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

36 Upon this preeminence (as I conceive) may safely be grounded the congruity of the divine mission. We often read that Christ was sent, from whence he bears the name of an *Apostle* himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the *Father sent him, so sent he them:* the Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son: but we never read that the Father was sent at all [12], there being an authority [13] in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission. In the parable, *a certain householder which planted a vineyard,* first *sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants; but last of all he sent unto them his son:* it had been inconsistent even with the literal sense of an historical parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customs of men, to have said, that last of all the Son sent his Father to them. So God, placing man in the vineyard of his Church, first sent his servants the Prophets, by whom he *spake at sundry times and in divers manners,* but *in the last days he sent his Son:* and it were as incongruous [14] and inconsistent with the divine generation, that the Son should send the Father into the world. *As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father,* saith our Saviour: intimating, that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him, because he lived by him, laying his generation as the proper ground of his mission. Thus he which begetteth sendeth, and he which is begotten is sent [15]. *For I am*

Heb. iii. 1. John xx. 21. Matt. xxi. 33, &c. Heb. i. 1, 2. John vi. 57. John vii. 29.

12 'Pater enim solus nusquam legitur missus.' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 5. [§. 8. vol. viii. p. 776 A.]

13 'Solus Pater non legitur missus, quoniam solus non habet auctorem a quo genitus sit, vel a quo procedat. Et ideo non propter naturæ diversitatem, quæ in Trinitate nulla est, sed propter ipsam auctoritatem, solus Pater non dicitur missus: non enim splendor aut fervor ignem, sed ignis mittit sive splendorem sive fervorem.' *S. August. Serm. cont. Arian. cap.* 4. [vol. viii. p. 627 F.] 'Qui mittit, potestatem suam in eo quod mittit, ostendit.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* viii. *cap.* 19. [p. 958 D.]

14 'Si voluisset Deus Pater per subjectam creaturam visibiliter apparere, absurdissime tamen aut a Filio, quem genuit, aut a Spiritu Sancto, qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur.' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap. ult.* [vol. viii. p. 832 C.]

15 'Filius est igitur a Patre missus, non Pater a Filio; quia Filius est a Patre natus, non Pater a Filio.' *Fulgent. lib.* viii. *cont. Fabianum, in Collect. Theodul. de S. S.* [p. 626. ed. 1684.] 'Quis autem Christianus ignorat quod Pater miserit, missusque sit Filius? Non enim genitorem ab eo quem genuit, sed genitum a genitore mitti oportebat.' *S. August. cont. Maximin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 14. [II. 14. 8. p. 707 F.] 'Ubi audis, *Ipse*

from him, and he hath sent me, saith the Son: from whom I received my essence by communication, from him also received I this commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give than to receive, to send than to be sent; so in respect of the sonship there is some priority in the divine Paternity: from whence divers of the ancients read that place of St. John with this addition [16], *The Father (which sent me) is greater than I.* He then is that *God who sent forth his Son made of a woman,* that *God who hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* So that the authority of sending is in the Father: which therefore ought to be acknowledged, because upon this mission is founded the highest testimony of his love to man; for *herein is love,* saith St. John, *not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.*

John xiv. 28. Gal. iv. 4, 6. 1 John iv. 10.

Again, the dignity of the Father will farther yet appear from the order of the Persons in the blessed Trinity, of which he is undoubtedly the first. For although in some passages of the Apostolical discourses the Son may first be named, (as in that of St. Paul, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all,* the latter part of which is nothing but an addition unto his constant benediction,) and in others the Holy Ghost precedes the Son (as, *Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all*); yet where the three persons are barely enumerated, and 37 delivered unto us as the rule of faith [17], there that order is

2 Cor. xiii. 14. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6.

me misit, noli intelligere naturæ dissimilitudinem, sed generantis auctoritatem.' *Idem, Tract.* 31. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. p. 521 F.] Ἐνταῦθα οὖν ὁ ἀποστείλας καὶ ὁ ἀποστελλόμενος, ἵνα δείξῃ τῶν πάντων ἀγαθῶν μίαν εἶναι τὴν πηγήν, τουτέστι τὸν πατέρα. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxix. §. 54. [p. 776 D.] Hence the language of the Schools, 'Missio importat processionem originis:' as Thomas Aquinas, 1. *q.* 43. *art.* 1. *ad primum;* or, 'auctoritatem principii:' as Durandus, *lib.* i. *dist.* 15. *q.* 1. §. 7.

16 Λέγουσι γὰρ τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κακῶς ἑρμηνεύοντες, ὅτι ὁ ἀποστείλας με πατὴρ μείζων μού ἐστι, saith Epiphanius of the Arians; and answering, grants in these words which follow, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἀποστείλας με πατὴρ, φάσκει, καὶ οὐχ ὁ κτίσας με. *Hæres.* lxix. §. 53. [vol. i. p. 775 B.] To the same purpose Athanasius, *de Hum. Nat. susc.* [c. 4. p. 873 D], and Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaur. lib.* xi. [vol. v. p. 85 B.] read it, Ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ. And St. Basil makes Eunomius read it so, in his first book against him, [c. 21.] and with that addition answers it. So the second Confession of the Council of Sirmium, both in the Latin original and Greek translation. *S. Hilar. de Syn.* [§. 11.] *S. Athanas.* [*de Syn.* §. 28.] *et Socrat. lib.* ii. *cap.* 30. [p. 127.]

17 Παραδιδοὺς ὁ κύριος τὴν σωτήριον πίστιν τοῖς μαθητευομένοις τῷ λόγῳ, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ συνάπτει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ

observed which is proper to them; witness the form of baptism, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* which order hath been perpetuated in all confessions of faith, and is for ever inviolably to be observed [18]. For that which is not instituted or invented by the will or design of man, but founded [19] in the nature of things themselves, is not to be altered at the pleasure of man. Now this priority doth properly and naturally result from the divine Paternity; so that the Son must necessarily be second [20] unto the Father, from whom he receiveth his

ἅγιον. *S. Basil. Epist.* 80. [Epist. CLXXXIX. 5. vol. iii. p. 278 D.]

[18] Ἀκίνητον καὶ ἀπαρεγχείρητον φυλάσσειν προσήκει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἣν ἐξ αὐτῆς τοῦ κυρίου τῆς φωνῆς παρελάβομεν, εἰπόντος, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα, &c. *S. Basil. Epist.* 78. [Epist. CXXV. 3. p. 217 A.]

[19] Ἔστι τι τάξεως εἶδος, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν θέσεως συνιστάμενον, ἀλλ' αὐτῇ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθίᾳ συμβαῖνον, ὡς τῷ πυρὶ πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ πρότερον τὸ αἴτιον λέγομεν, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ.—πῶς οὖν εὔλογον ἀρνεῖσθαι τὴν τάξιν, ἐφ' ᾧν ἐστι πρότερον καὶ δεύτερον, οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν θέσιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν αὐτοῖς ἐνυπαρχούσης ἀκολουθίας; *S. Basil. adv. Eunom. lib.* i. [§. 20. vol. i. p. 232 A.]

[20] Δευτερεύει μὲν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς τῷ αἰτίῳ· δευτερεύει δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον. *S. Basil. apud Georg. Pachym. Hist. lib.* vii. [c. ix. p. 20 B.] Ὡς γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τάξει μὲν δεύτερος τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅτι ἀπ' ἐκείνου, καὶ ἀξιώματι, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ὁ πατὴρ, [τῷ εἶναι αὐτοῦ πατέρα, in the Benedictine ed.] καὶ ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἡ πρόσοδος καὶ προσαγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα· φύσει δὲ οὐκέτι δεύτερος, διότι ἡ θεότης ἐν ἑκατέρῳ μία· οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τὸν υἱὸν τῇ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι—οὐκέτ' ἂν εἰκότως ὡς ἀλλοτρίας ὑπάρχον φύσεως. *S. Basil. cont. Eunom. lib.* iii. [§. 1. vol. i. p. 272 B.] 'Si unum Deum singulariter nominamus, excludentes vocabulum secundæ personæ, furorem ejus hæresis approbamus, quæ ipsum asserit Patrem passum.' *Phœbad. cont. Arian.* [c. xxii. p. 256 D.] 'Illi cui est in Filio secunda persona, est et tertia in Spiritu Sancto.' *Idem.* 'Sic alius a Filio Spiritus, sicut a Patre Filius; sic tertia in Spiritu ut in Filio secunda persona.' *Ibid.* 'Omne quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit ejus necesse est de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum. Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt; et tertius ubi est, tres sunt; tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio.' *Tertul. adv. Prax. cap.* 8. [p. 504 C.] 'Sic alium a se Paracletum, quomodo et nos a Patre alium Filium; ut tertium gradum ostenderet in Paracleto, sicut nos secundum in Filio.' *Ibid. cap.* 9. [p. 505 A.] 'Hic interim acceptum a Patre munus effudit Spiritum Sanctum, tertium nomen divinitatis, et tertium gradum majestatis.' *cap.* 30. [p. 518 D.] Ὁ δὲ ὡς ἐξ αἰτίου γεγονὼς υἱὸς, δεύτερος οὗ ἐστιν υἱὸς καθέστηκε, παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τοιόσδε εἶναι εἰληφώς. *Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib.* iv. *cap.* 3. [p. 147 D.] 'Et quidem confessione communi secunda quidem ab auctore nativitas est, quia ex Deo est; non tamen separabilis ab auctore, quia in quantum sensus noster intelligentiam tentabit nativitatis excedere, in tantum necesse est etiam generationis excedat.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* xii. *cap.* 51. [p. 1139 E.] 'Tua enim res est, et unigenitus tuus est—filius ex te Deo Patre Deus verus, et a te in naturæ tuæ unitate genitus, post te ita confitendus, ut tecum, quia æternæ originis suæ auctor æternus es. Nam dum ex te est, secundus a te est.' *Idem, cap.* 54. [p. 1141 B.] This by the Schools is called *Ordo naturæ, ordo originis, ordo naturalis præsuppositionis.* Which being so generally acknowledged by the Fathers, when we read in the Athanasian Creed, *In this Trinity none is afore or after other,* we must understand it of the priority of perfection or time.

origination, and the Holy Ghost unto the Son. Neither can we be thought to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the first Person of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous testimonies of the ancient doctors of the Church, who have not stuck to call the Father the origin [21], the cause [22], 38

21 Μικρῶν γὰρ ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀναξίων ἀρχὴ, μᾶλλον δὲ μικρῶς τε καὶ ἀναξίως· μὴ θεότητος ὢν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀγαθότητος τῆς ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πνεύματι θεωρουμένης. *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 1. *et* 29. [Orat. ii. §. 38. vol. i. p. 30 D.] Μὴ χρονικὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ καταδέξῃ τινὸς λέγοντος, ἀλλὰ ἄχρονον ἀρχὴν γίνωσκε τὸν πατέρα· ἀρχὴ γὰρ υἱοῦ ἄχρονος, ἀκατάληπτος. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* 11. [§. 20. p. 159 A.] Ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν πατρὸς οὐδεμία, ἀρχὴ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ πατήρ. *S. Basil. cont. Eunom. lib.* ii. [§. 12. vol. i. p. 247 C.] Φαίνεται λοιπὸν ὁ μακάριος εὐαγγελιστὴς σαφέστερον ἡμῖν ἑρμηνεύων τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄνομα. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερον, ὡς εἰκὸς, τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶναί φησιν, ἢ αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα, ἀφ' οὗπερ ὁ ζῶν ἐξέλαμψε λόγος, καθάπερ ἐξ ἡλίου τὸ φῶς. οὐκοῦν ἀρχὴ τῷ υἱῷ ὁ πατήρ. *S. Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. cap.* 32. [vol. v. p. 312 C.] 'Cum dixisset, *quem mittet Pater*, addidit, *in nomine meo:* non tamen dixit, *quem mittet Pater a me*, quemadmodum dixit, *quem ego mittam vobis a Patre;* videlicet ostendens quod totius Divinitatis, vel, si melius dicitur, Deitatis, principium Pater est.' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 20. [§. 29. vol. viii. p. 829 E.] 'Unum principium ad creaturam dicitur Deus, non duo vel tria principia. Ad se autem invicem in Trinitate, si gignens ad id quod gignitur [gignit] principium est, Pater ad Filium principium est, quia gignit eum.' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* v. cap. 14. [c. 13. §. 14, 15. vol. viii. p. 840 F.] 'Pater ergo principium Deitatis.' *Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. cap.* 1. [p. 75 A.] In this sense the Greek Fathers used ἄναρχος as proper to the Father, (in the same notion with ἀγέννητος, with relation to the *principium productionis,*) and denied it to the Son: Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς, ἐὰν μὲν ὡς αἴτιον τὸν πατέρα λαμβάνῃς, οὐκ ἄναρχος, ἀρχὴ γὰρ υἱοῦ πατὴρ ὡς αἴτιος· ἐὰν δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ χρόνου νοῇς ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἄναρχος. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 29. [Orat. xx. §. 7. vol. i. p. 380 C.] Εἴ τις ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄναρχον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν, ὡς δύο ἄναρχα καὶ δύο ἀγέννητα λέγων, καὶ δύο ποιῶν θεοὺς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. *Syn. Sirm. Conf. prima.* [Socrates, lib. ii. c. 30. vol. ii. p. 126.] Thus first translated into Latin: 'Si quis innascibilem et sine initio dicat Filium, tanquam duo sine principio, et duo innascibilia, et duo innata dicens, duos faciat Deos, anathema sit.' *S. Hilar. de Syn.* [c. 38. p. 1177 B.] In which sense the Platonists did understand ἀγέννητος of God. Ὥστε οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τῇ λεγομένῃ ὕλῃ τὸ κοσμεῖσθαι, εἴπερ ἀγέννητος εἴη μὴ ἀπὸ χρόνου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ αἰτιοῦ· καθ' ὃ σημαινόμενον καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀγέννητον λέγομεν. *Hierocles de Provid.* [p. 248.] And the Latins, attributing the term *principium* to the Son, do it with the addition of *de* or *ex principio.* 'Pater principium non de principio, Filius principium de principio.' *S. August. cont. Maximin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 17. [II. 17. 4. vol. viii. p. 716 E.] 'Principium ex principio et unum est, et initio caret.' *Faustus Rheg. Epist.* 16. [p. 531 C.] '*Ex ore*, inquit, *Altissimi prodivi.* Hæc est enim nativitas perfecta Sermonis, hoc est principium sine principio; hic est ortus habens initium in nativitate, in statu non habens.' *Phœbad. cont. Arian.* [c. xi. p. 253 A.] 'Sicut in creaturis invenitur principium primum et principium secundum; ita in personis divinis invenitur principium non de principio, quod est Pater, et principium a principio, quod est Filius.' *Tho. Aquin.* 1. *q.* 33. *art.* 4. And to this all the Schoolmen writing on his Sums agree, as all upon the Sentences. 1 *Dist.* 29.

22 Αἰτία ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πάσης. *S. Athanas. Dissert. Orthod. et Anom.* [De Trinitate, Dial. ii. §. 23. vol. ii. p. 502 F.] Ἀλλά τις ἐστὶ δύναμις ἀγεννήτως καὶ ἀνάρχως ὑφεστῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν αἰτία τῆς ἁπάντων τῶν ὄντων αἰτίας· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. *S. Basil. Epist.* 43. [Epist. xxxviii. 4. vol. iii. p. 117 C.] And

the author [23], the root [24], the fountain [25], and the head [26] of the Son, or the whole Divinity.

upon that place, *This day have I begotten thee:* Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν, γεγέννηκα, *τὴν αἰτίαν ἀφ' ἧς ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι σημαίνει. Idem, cont. Eunom. lib.* ii. [§. 17. vol. i. p. 252 D.] Πῶς οὐδεμίαν *διαφορὰν καταλείπει, οὐδὲ τὴν τοῖς αἰτίοις πρὸς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐνυπάρχουσαν; Idem, lib.* i. [§. 23. p. 234 E.] Πρὸς τὸ, *ὅτι ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου, ἐκεῖνο εἰδέναι χρὴ, ὅτι ἀρχὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ αἰτίαν ἐπιγραφόμενος τὸν πατέρα, ταῦτα λέγει. Idem, Epist.* 64. [Epist. ccx. 4. vol. iii. p. 315 D.] Διαφορὰν *τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐν μόναις ταῖς τρίσιν ἰδιότησι, τῇ ἀναιτίῳ καὶ πατρικῇ, καὶ αἰτιατῇ υἱϊκῇ, καὶ τῇ αἰτιατῇ καὶ ἐκπορευτῇ, ἐπιγιγνώσκομεν. Damasc. lib.* iv. *cap.* 5. [lib. iii. c. 5. p. 210 C.] Τὸν *πατέρα τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας, καὶ προβολέα τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν καὶ ἀρχὴν φαμεν τῆς θεότητος εἶναι. Zachar. Mitylen.* [Galland. xi. p. 285 E.] And although Thomas Aquinas, and Eugenius Bishop of Rome, in the definition of the Council of Florence, have observed that the Greeks in this case do use the term of *causa*, but the Latins only *principium;* yet the very Latin Fathers in the twenty-fifth Session of the same Council have these words, Μίαν *γινώσκομεν τὸν πατέρα αἰτίαν, καὶ ῥίζαν, καὶ πηγὴν τῆς θεότητος·* [Mansi, xxxi. p. 880 D.] and we have before cited Victorinus Afer, who says 'Pater causa est ipsi Filio ut sit.' [lib. i. adv. Ar. p. 193 C.] So St. Hilary, 'Deum nasci, non est aliud quam in ea natura esse qua Deus est; quia nasci cum causam nativitatis ostendat, non disproficit tamen in genere auctoris existere.' *De Trin. lib.* xi. cap. 11. [p. 1088 F.] 'Ex spiritu enim spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate spiritus, per quam et ipse spiritus est, nascatur, non tamen alia ei præterquam perfectarum atque indemutabilium causarum ad id quod nascitur causa est; et ex causa, licet perfecta atque indemutabili nascens, necesse est ex causa in causæ ipsius proprietate nascatur.' *Idem, lib.* xii. *cap.* 8. [p. 1116 E.] 'Qui ex eo qui est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, quia ei is qui est, ad id quod est, causa est, non etiam id quod non est, origo nascendi est.' *Ibid. cap.* 17. [p. 1120 E.] 'Deus omnium quæ sunt causa est. Quod autem omnium rerum causa est, etiam sapientiæ suæ causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientia sua. Igitur sempiternæ sapientiæ suæ causa est sempiterna.' *S. August. lib. de divers. quæst.* lxxxiii. *quæst.* 16. [vol. vi. p. 4 F.] And as they called the Father the cause of the Son, so they accounted it the propriety of the Father to be without a cause, as appears out of Alexander the Bishop of Alexandria's Epistle before produced.

[23] We have cited Phœbadius speaking so before; to which may be added, 'Si quis igitur adhuc et de Apostolo requirit dominicum statum, id est, singularis substantiæ dualitatem quæ per naturam auctori suo jungatur:' [c. Arianos, c. xxi. p. 256 B.] *et paulo post;* 'Sed cum refertur ex ipso, certe ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium respicitur auctorem.' St. Hilary is known to speak frequently of the authority of the Father, as of the author of his Son; and several places have been already collected, especially by Petavius, to which these may be added, besides what have been already produced. 'Ipso quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit auctor ostenditur.' *De Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 9. [p. 831 E.] 'Cum potius honor Filii dignitas sit paterna, et gloriosus auctor sit ex quo is, qui tali gloria sit dignus, exstiterit.' *Ibid. cap.* 10. [p. 832 B.] 'Aliud est sine auctore esse semper æternum, aliud quod patri, id est, auctori, est coæternum. Ubi enim pater auctor est, ibi et nativitas est. At vero ubi auctor æternus est, ibi et nativitas æterna est: quia sicut nativitas ab auctore est, ita et ab æterno auctore æterna nativitas est.' *Idem, lib.* xii. *cap.* 21. [p. 1123 A.] 'Quod vero ex æterno natum est, id si non æternum natum est, jam non erit et pater auctor æternus. Si quid igitur ei, qui ab æterno patre natus est, ex æternitate defuerit, id ipsum auctori non est ambiguum defuisse.' *Ibid.* 'Natum non post aliquid, sed ante omnia: ut nativitas tantum testetur auctorem, non

præposterum aliquid in se ab auctore significet.' *Ibid. cap.* 51. [p. 1139 D.] 'Natum autem ita, ut nihil aliud quam te sibi significet auctorem.' *Ibid. cap.* 52. [p. 1140 C.] 'Ipsius tamen auctor est Pater generando sine initio.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 6. p. cciv.] 'Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filio dicis auctorem, quia ille genuit, genitus est iste, quia iste de illo est, non ille de isto; fateor et concedo.' *S. August. cont. Maximin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 14. [II. 14. 6. vol. viii. p. 706 A.]

24 'Nec dubitaverim Filium dicere, et radicis fruticem, et fontis fluvium, et solis radium.' *Tertul. adv. Prax. cap.* 8. [p. 504 C.] 'Nec frutex tamen a radice, nec fluvius a fonte, nec radius a sole discernitur; sicut nec a Deo Sermo.' *Ibid.* Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνενδεὲς, ῥίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. *S. Basil. Homil. cont. Sabellianos* [§. 4. vol. ii. p. 193 D.] 'Dominus Pater, quia radix est Filii.' *S. Ambros. in Luc. lib.* x. *cap.* 1. [§. 5. vol. i. p. 1505 B.] *ut et de Fide, lib.* iv. *cap.* 5. St. Cyril of Alexandria, speaking of the baptismal institution, Τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀνωτάτω ῥίζαν ἧς ἐπέκεινα τὸ συμπὰν οὐδὲν, ἐννοήσεις τὸν πατέρα· τὸν δέ γε τῆς ἀνωτάτω ῥίζης ἐκπεφυκότα καὶ γεγεννημένον, παραδέξῃ τὸν υἱόν. *De S. Trin. Dial.* 2. [vol. v. p. 422 E.]

2 Ἄναρχος ὁ πατὴρ, πηγὴ τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ποταμοῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς ὁ πατήρ. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* xi. [§. 20. p. 159 A.] 'In hac ergo natura filius est, et in hoc originis fonte subsistens processit ex sapiente sapientia, ex forti virtus, ex lumine splendor.' *Vigil. African. Disp.* [p. 702 C.] Ὡς πνεῦμα θεοῦ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πεφηνὸς, αἴτιον αὐτὸν ἔχον, ὡς πηγὴν ἑαυτοῦ, κἀκεῖθεν πήγαζον. *S. Basil. Homil.* 28. Λέγει περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ θεία γραφὴ, Κλίνω, φησὶν, ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὡς ποταμὸς εἰρήνης· ἐκπορευόμενος δηλονότι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθοῦς πηγῆς τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεότητος. *Act. Concil. Nic. lib.* ii. *cap.* 22. [Mansi, i. p. 367 C.] And St. Cyril of Alexandria, who often useth this expression, gives us the full signification of it in these words, upon the first chapter of St. John: [vol. iv. p. 12 A.] Ἀδικήσει δὲ ὅλως οὐδὲν τὸ ὡς ἐν πηγῇ τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν ὑπάρχειν ἐννοεῖν· μόνον γὰρ τὸ ἐξ οὗ τὸ τῆς πηγῆς ἐν τούτοις ὄνομα σημαίνει. 'Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, sed ingenitum profitemur: ipse enim a nullo originem ducit, ex quo et Filius nativitatem, et Spiritus Sanctus processionem accepit. Fons ergo ipse et origo est totius divinitatis.' *Concil. Toletan.* xi. [*Præfatio.* Mansi, xi. p. 132 E.] 'Quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est et manere in æternum; et sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivus de fonte traduxit?' *Lactan. de Ver. Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 8. [vol. i. p. 259.] *et rursus, cap.* 29. 'Cum igitur et Pater Filium faciat, et Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est; sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam sol, hic tanquam radius a sole porrectus*.' [p. 320.]

26 'Caput, quod est principium omnium, Filius: caput autem, quod est principium Christi, Deus.' *Concil. Sirm.* [Mansi, iii. p. 260 D.] accepted and expounded as orthodox by St. Hilary. 'Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus.' *S. Hilar. de Syn.* [c. 60. p. 1185 C.] 'Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 6. p. cciv.]

Tu capitis primique caput, tu fontis origo.

Hilar. ad Leonem. [v. 9. p. 1369 D.] Οὔτε δύο εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ, ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ, μία ἡ ἀρχή. *Cyril. Hier. Catech.* xi. [§. 14. p. 156.] 'Caput Filii Pater est, et caput Spiritus Sancti Filius, quia de ipso accepit.' *S. August. Quæst. Vet. Test.* 9. St. Chrysostom is so clearly of the opinion that 1 Cor. xi. is to be understood of Christ as God, that from thence he proves him to have the same essence with God: Εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὁμοούσιος δὲ ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ σώματι· κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ θεὸς, ὁμοούσιος ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί. [Hom. xxvi. in Act. Apost. vol. x. p. 229 B.] So likewise Theodoret upon the same place: Ἡ δὲ γυνὴ οὐ ποίημα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ἀνδρός· οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς ἄρα ποίημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ. [In Ep. ad Cor. i. vol. iii. p. 172 A.] So St. Cyril. Κεφαλὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν· γεγέννηται γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός. *Ad Regin. Ep.* 1. [de Recta Fide, p. 64 A.]

* [Upon the subject of this note, see Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* iv. 1. 3.]

For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the Person of the Father, *of whom are all things,* and the Person of the Son, *by whom are all things.* 1 Cor. viii. 6. Secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this, that as the branch is from the root, and river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that being which they have; whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river: so the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him; the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none.

Some indeed of the ancients may seem to have made yet a farther difference between the Persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation terms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the Father[27] had; because he was not begotten of himself, the Father[28] had been so; because he is not the cause of himself, the Father[29] were. Whereas, if we speak properly, God the Father hath
39 neither his being from another, nor from himself[30]; not from another, that were repugnant to his Paternity; not from himself, that were a contradiction in itself. And therefore those expressions are not to be understood positively and affirmatively, but negatively and exclusively[31], that he hath his essence from

27 *Lactan. lib.* i. *cap.* 8. *S. Hilar. lib.* ii. *Zach. Mitylen.*

28 *Lactan. ibid. Synes. Hymn.*

29 *S. Hieron. in cap.* iii. *ad Eph.* [vol. vii.]

30 Ἄναρχος οὖν ὁ πατήρ· οὐ γὰρ ἐτέρωθεν αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 30. [Orat. xx. §. 7. vol. i. p. 380 C.] Ὁ ἀγέννητος οὐ γεγέννηται, οὔθ' ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὔθ' ὑφ' ἑτέρου. *S. Athanas.* 'Si rursum quod a semetipso sit accipias, nemo sibi ipse et munerator et munus est.' *S. Hil. de Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [p. 792 D.] 'Qui putant Deum ejus potentiæ esse ut seipsum ipse genuerit, eo plus errant, quod non solum Deus ita non est, sed neque corporalis neque spiritualis creatura. Nulla enim omnino res est quæ seipsam gignat ut sit. Et ideo non est credendum, vel dicendum, quod Deus genuit se.' *S. August.*

31 This appeareth by those expositions which have been given of such words as seem to bear the affirmation: as Αὐτογένεθλος, αὐτοφυής, αὐτόγονος, αὐτογενής, &c. Αὐτογενής, αὐτογένεθλος, οὐκ ἔκ τινος γεννώμενος. *Hesych.* And Αὐτολόχευτος, Θεὸς ἀγέννητος, αὐτογένητος. *Idem.* And after him Suidas: Αὐτολόχευτος, αὐτογένητος, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀγέννητος. And if αὐτογένητος be not αὐτόθεν γεννητός, no more is αὐτόθεος to be taken for αὐτόθεν, or ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ θεός. Eusebius in his Panegyrical Oration gives this title to the Son, Οἷα τοῦ καθόλου Θεοῦ παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ αὐτόθεον προσκυνεῖσθαι. *Hist. lib.* x. *cap.* 4. [p. 468.] And in his Evangelical Demonstration calls him, Αὐτονοῦν, καὶ αὐτολόγον, καὶ αὐτοσοφίαν, καὶ εἴ τι δὲ αὐτοκαλὸν καὶ αὐτοαγαθόν. *lib.* iv. *cap.* 2. [p. 146 A.] And in the thirteenth chapter of the same book, with relation to the former words, Τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, αὐτοζωὴ τυγχάνων, καὶ αὐτοφῶς νοερόν, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα προκατείλεκται. Theodoret terms him, Αὐτοδύναμιν καὶ αὐτοζωὴν καὶ αὐτοσοφίαν. *cont. Anathem. quartum Cyrilli.* [vol. iv. p. 712 C.] St. Basil, Αὐτοζωήν, *in Psal.* xlviii. *et de Spiritu Sancto, cap.* 8. and Αὐτοδικαιοσύνην. *Epist.* 141. [al. viii.] St. Chrysostom, Αὐτοαθανασίαν,

none, that he is not begotten of any, nor hath he any cause of his existence. So that the proper notion of the Father in whom

αὐτομακαριότητα. St. Athanasius gives him them, and many more to the same purpose. And before all these Origen: Ὃν μὲν νομίζομεν καὶ πεπείσμεθα ἀρχῆθεν εἶναι Θεὸν, καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ, οὗτος ὁ αὐτολόγος ἐστὶ, καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία, καὶ ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια. [c. Cels. iii. 41. vol. i. p. 474 A.] And again, Τίς μᾶλλον τῆς Ἰησοῦ ψυχῆς ἢ κἂν παραπλησίως κεκόλληται τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ αὐτολόγῳ καὶ αὐτοσοφίᾳ καὶ αὐτοαληθείᾳ καὶ αὐτοδικαιοσύνῃ; *lib.* vi. [c. 47. p. 669 F.] Εἰκὼν μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεώς ἐστιν ὁ αὐτολόγος, καὶ ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία. *Ibid.* [§. 63. p. 680 D.] And certainly in the same sense that αὐτός is joined with one attribute, it may be joined with any other, and with the Godhead: because all the attributes of God are really the same, not only with themselves, but with the essence. But in what sense it ought to be understood, when thus used by the Fathers, it will be necessary to inquire, lest it be so attributed to the Son, as it prove derogatory to the Father. St. Basil, I confess, may seem so to speak, as if the Son were therefore αὐτοζωή, because he hath life of himself, not from the Father, (and consequently he may be termed αὐτόθεος, as God of himself, not from the Father,) for he denieth those words, *I live by the Father*, to be spoken of Christ, according to his divine nature, and that only for this reason, that if it were so understood, he could not be called αὐτοζωή. Εἰ διὰ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ζῇ, δι' ἕτερον καὶ οὐ δι' ἑαυτὸν ζῇ· ὁ δὲ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν, αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι οὐ δύναται· from whence he concludeth, εἰς τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν οὖν, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν θεότητα, τὸ εἰρημένον νοεῖν δεῖ. *cont. Eunom. lib.* iv. [vol. i. p. 290 D.] But because the authority of that book is questioned*, I shall produce the same author upon the same Scripture, speaking to the same purpose, in his 141st Epistle, which is unquestionably genuine: Ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν οὐ τὴν προαιώνιον, ὡς οἶμαι, ζωὴν ὀνομάζει· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν, αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι οὐ δύναται. [Epist. VIII. 4. vol. iii. p. 83 E.] To which testimonies I answer, first, that those words of his, ὡς οἶμαι, (*as I think,*) shew that he doth not absolutely deny these words of Christ to be understood of his Divinity, of which the rest of the Fathers quoted before did understand it; and not only they, but St. Basil himself, in his book *de Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 8, hath delivered a clear resolution of this point according to that interpretation, wholly consonant to his doctrine of the Trinity in other parts of his works: Ὅμως μέντοι, ἵνα μή ποτε ἐκ τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν ἐνεργουμένων περισπασθῶμεν εἰς τὸ φαντασθῆναι ἄναρχον εἶναι τὸν κύριον, τί φησιν ἡ αὐτοζωή; Ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα. καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις; Οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν. καὶ ἡ αὐτοτέλης σοφία; Ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον, τί εἴπω, καὶ τί λαλήσω; [§. 19. vol. iii. p. 16 E.] Christ therefore as αὐτοζωή spake those words, *I live by the Father*, and by them shewed his origination from him, from whom he received his life, power, and wisdom, as receiving his essence, which is the same with them: wherefore those former passages are to be looked upon, as if αὐτός in composition did not deny origination, but participation, or receiving by way of affection. And that he understood it so, appears out of the places themselves: for in the first, after ὁ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι οὐ δύναται, immediately followeth, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ κατὰ χάριν ἅγιος αὐτοάγιος· and in the second, after πᾶν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι οὐ δύναται, followeth likewise, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸ ὑφ' ἑτέρου θερμανθὲν αὐτοθερμότης εἶναι. The meaning then of St. Basil must be this, that he which receiveth life from another merely as a grace or favour, as the saints receive their sanctity, cannot properly be termed αὐτοζωή, no more than they αὐτοάγιοι· or if he receive it by derivation or participation, as water receiveth heat from fire, he deserveth the same name no more than water heated to be called αὐτοθερμότης. And this is fully consonant to the expressions of the rest of the ancients: as particularly Athanasius, Οὐ κατὰ μετοχὴν ταῦτα ὢν, οὐδὲ ἔξωθεν ἐπιγινομένων τούτων αὐτῷ

* [The Benedictine editor considers it genuine.]

we believe is this, that he is a Person subsisting eternally in the one infinite essence of the Godhead; which essence or subsistence he hath received from no other Person, but hath communicated the same essence, in which himself subsisteth, by generation to another person, who by that generation is the Son.

Howsoever, it is most reasonable to assert that there is but one Person who is from none; and the very generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove, that neither of those two can be that Person. For whosoever is generated is from him which is the genitor, and whosoever proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be. It followeth therefore that this Person is the Father, which name speaks nothing of dependence, nor supposeth any kind of priority in another.

κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ μετέχοντας, καὶ σοφιζομένους δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ δυνατοὺς, καὶ λογικοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένους· ἀλλ' αὐτοσοφία, αὐτολόγος, αὐτοδύναμις ἰδία τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν, αὐτοφῶς, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαρετή. *in fine Protrept.* [Orat. cont. Gent. §. 46. vol. i. p. 46 A.] And to the same purpose, Ὅτι οὐ μεθεκτὴν ἔχει τὴν δωρεὰν, ἀλλ' αὐτοπηγὴ καὶ αὐτόρριζα πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, αὐτοζωὴ καὶ αὐτοφῶς, καὶ αὐτοαλήθεια, in the MS. Catena in the king of France's library. *Petav. de Trin. lib.* vi. *cap.* 11. All therefore which these compositions signify, is either a negation of a derivative participation, or an affirmation of a reality and identity of substance, as yet farther appears by St. Epiphanius, Αὐτοουσία ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οὐχ ἑτερουσία· and Origen himself upon St. John, Ἡ αὐτοδικαιοσύνη ἡ οὐσιώδης, Χριστός ἐστι. [vol. iv. p. 107 E.], as also ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια ἡ οὐσιώδης, καὶ, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, πρωτότυπος τῆς ἐν ταῖς λογικαῖς ψυχαῖς ἀληθείας.[Ibid.] To conclude, there is a catholic sense in which the Son is termed αὐτόθεος, αὐτοσοφία, &c. by the ancient Fathers; and another sense there is in which these terms are so proper and peculiar to the Father, that they are denied to the Son. Indeed αὐτόθεος, in the highest sense, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεός, positively taken, belongeth neither to the Son nor to the Father, as implying a manifest contradiction; because nothing can have its being actually from itself, as communicated to itself, and that by itself: but in a negative way of interpretation, by which that is said to be of itself, which is and yet is not of or from another, αὐτόθεος belongs properly to the Father, neither generated by, nor proceeding from another; and in that sense it is denied to the Son, because he is generated by the Father, as ἐκ θεοῦ θεὸς, ἐκ σοφοῦ σοφία, ἐκ λογικοῦ λόγος, καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς υἱός. saith St. Athanasius, *cont. Arian. Orat.* v. [Orat. iv. 1. p. 618 B.] from whence he thus proceeds, Ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἄν τις εἴποι αὐτοσοφίαν εἶναι καὶ αὐτολόγον τὸν θεὸν, ἀλλ' εἰ τοῦτο, εἴη ἂν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ πατὴρ καὶ υἱός. [Ib. §. 2. p. 618 D.] And again, Εἰ δὲ αὐτοσοφία ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τούτου ἄτοπον εἴρηται παρὰ Σαβελλίῳ. [Ibid.] Lastly, in another sense, in which αὐτός in composition is taken not *in obliquo*, but *in recto*; αὐτόθεος, that is, αὐτὸς ὁ θεός, *God himself*, and αὐτοζωὴ, αὐτὴ ἡ ζωή, *life itself*; so all these terms are attributed to the Son as truly, really, and essentially, as to the Father. And that the Fathers took it so appears, because they did sometimes resolve the composition: as when Eusebius calleth Christ αὐτόθεον, in the Panegyrick before cited, presently after he speaketh thus: [Eus. H. E. x. 4. p. 469.] Τί γὰρ καὶ ἔμελλε τοῦ παμβασιλέως καὶ πανηγεμόνος καὶ αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου ἐνστήσεσθαι τῷ νεύματι; where αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ is the same with αὐτοθέου. [For the subject of this note, see Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* iv. 1. 7.]

From hence it is observed that the name of God, taken absolutely[32], is often in the Scriptures spoken of the Father: as when we read of *God sending his only Son;* of *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God;* and generally wheresoever Christ is called the Son of God, or the Word of God, the name of God is to be taken particularly for the Father, because he is no Son but of the Father. From hence he is styled *one God, the true God, the only true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*[33].

[Rom. viii. 3.] 2 Cor. xiii. 14. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Eph. iv. 6. 1 Thess. i. 9. John xvii. 5. 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 3.

Which, as it is most true, and so fit to be believed, is also a most necessary truth, and therefore to be acknowledged, for the avoiding multiplication and plurality of Gods[34]. For if there were more than one which were from none, it could not be denied but there were more Gods than one. Wherefore this origination[35]

32 "Οθεν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ πᾶσα σχεδὸν ἡ θεία γραφὴ, ὅταν εἴπῃ, ὁ Θεὸς, οὕτως ἀπολύτως καὶ ἀπροσδιορίστως, καὶ ὡς ἐπίπαν σὺν ἄρθρῳ, καὶ χωρὶς ἰδιώματος ὑποστατικοῦ, τὸν πατέρα δηλοῖ. *Theod. Abucara Opusc.* 42. [p. 437 C.]

33 'Unxit te Deus, Deus tuus. Id enim quod ait, *tuus*, ad nativitatem refertur; cæterum non perimit naturam. Et idcirco Deus ejus est, quia ex eo natus in Deum est. Non tamen per id quod Pater Deus est, non et Filius Deus est. *Unxit* enim *te, Deus, Deus tuus;* designata videlicet et auctoris et ex eo geniti significatione, uno eodemque dicto utrumque illum in naturæ ejusdem et dignitatis nuncupatione constituit.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 35. [p. 848 B.] 'Deo enim ex quo omnia sunt Deus nullus est, qui sine initio æternus est. Filio autem Deus Pater est, ex eo enim Deus natus est.' *Idem, cap.* 37. [p. 849 B.] 'Cum autem ex Deo Deus est, per id quoque Deus Pater Deo Filio et nativitatis ejus Deus est, et naturæ Pater, quia Dei nativitas et ex Deo est, et in ea est generis natura qua Deus est.' *Idem, lib.* xi. *cap.* 11. [p. 1089 A.] So St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 11. [§. 18. p. 158 A.] Θεὸς ὁ γεννήσας, Θεὸς ὁ γεννηθείς· Θεὸς μὲν τῶν πάντων· Θεὸν δὲ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν πατέρα ἐπιγραφόμενος.

34 Μή μοι—εἴπητε, δύο θεοὺς κηρύττει, πολυθεΐαν καταγγέλλει· οὐ δύο θεοὶ, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύο πατέρες· ὁ μὲν ἀρχὰς εἰσάγων δύο, δύο κηρύττει θεούς. *S. Basil. Hom. cont. Sabellianos.* [Hom. xxiv. §. 4. vol. ii. p. 192 A.] 'In duobus ingenitis diversa Divinitas invenitur; in uno autem genito ex uno ingenito naturalis unitas demonstratur.' *Fulgent. Resp. cont. Arian. ad Obj.* 5. [p. 59.] 'Si quis innascibilem et sine initio dicat Filium, tanquam duo sine principio, et duo innascibilia, et duo innata dicens, duos faciat Deos anathema sit.' *Concil. Sirm.* [Mansi, iii. p. 260 D.] 'Deus utique procedens ex Deo, secundam personam efficiens, sed non eripiens illud Patri, quod unus est Deus. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroque ostensa, duos faceret innatos, et ideo duos faceret Deos. Si non genitus esset, collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, et æquales inventi, duos Deos merito reddidisset non geniti; atque ideo duos Christus reddidisset Deos. Si sine origine esset ut Pater inventus, et ipse principium omnium ut Pater, duo faciens principia, duos ostendisset nobis consequenter et Deos,' &c. *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 31. [p. 729 D.]

35 "Ωσπερ δὲ μία ἀρχὴ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο εἷς θεός. *S. Athanas. Orat.* 5. [Orat. iv. 1. vol. i. p. 617 E.] Τηροῖτο δ' ἂν, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, εἷς μὲν θεὸς, εἷς ἓν αἴτιον καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 29. [Orat. xx. §. 7. vol. i. p. 379 E.] "Οπου γὰρ μία μὲν ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἓν δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἓν μὲν τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, μία δὲ ἡ εἰκὼν, ὁ τῆς ἑνότητος λόγος οὐ δια-

in the Divine Paternity hath anciently been looked upon as the assertion of the Unity: and therefore the Son and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both from the Father, who is one, and so the union of them [36].

Secondly, It is necessary thus to believe in the Father, because our salvation is propounded to us by an access unto the Father. We are all gone away and fallen from God, and we must be brought to him again. There is no other notion under which we can be brought to God as to be saved, but the notion of the Father; and there is no other person can bring us to the Father, but the Son of that Father: for, as the Apostle teacheth us, *through him we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.* Eph. ii. 18.

41 Having thus described the true nature and notion of the Divine Paternity, in all the several degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in God the Father:* by which I conceive him to express thus much:

As I am assured that there is an infinite and independent Being, which we call *a God*, and that it is impossible there should be more infinities than one: so I assure myself that this one God is the *Father* of all things, especially of all men and angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be styled generation; that he is farther yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the Father of all those whom he regenerateth by his Spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and co-heirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But

φθείρεται. *S. Basil. Homil. cont. Sabellian.* [§. 4. vol. ii. p. 192 C.] 'Patri suo originem suam debens, discordiam Divinitatis de numero duorum Deorum facere non potuit, qui ex illo qui est unus Deus originem nascendo contraxit.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 31. [p. 730 A.] 'Confitemur—non Deos duos sed Deum unum, neque per id non et Deum Dei Filium, est enim ex Deo Deus; non innascibiles duos, quia auctoritate innascibilitatis Deus unus est.' *S. Hilary de Synod.* [c. 64. p. 1187 C.] whose assertion is, 'Unum Deum esse ex quo omnia, unam virtutem innascibilem, et unam hanc esse sine initio potestatem:' which words belong unto the Father, and then it followeth of the Son: 'Non enim Patri adimitur quod Deus unus est, quia et Filius Deus sit. Est enim Deus ex Deo, unus ex uno: ob id unus Deus, quia ex se Deus. Contra vero non minus per id Filius Deus, quia Pater Deus unus sit. Est enim unigenitus Filius Dei, non innascibilis, ut Patri adimat quod Deus unus sit.' *De Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 836 A, B.]

36 Φύσις δὲ τοῖς τρισὶ μία, θεός· ἕνωσις δὲ, ὁ πατὴρ, ἐξ οὗ, καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἐξῆς. *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 32. [Orat. XLII. 15. vol. i. p. 758 D.] Unto which words those of Theodore Abucara have relation, Θεὸς δὲ ἐξαιρέτως λέγεται, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἕνωσις, ἤτοι ἀνάπτυξις καὶ ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῆς τριάδος, ὁ πατήρ ἐστιν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ θεολόγος. *Opusc.* 42. [p. 437 D.]

beyond and far above all this, beside his general offspring, and
John i. 12. peculiar people, *to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God*, I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his only-begotten Son: whom he hath not only begotten of the blessed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power; not only sent with special authority as the King of Israel; not only raised from the dead, and made Heir of all things in his house; but antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternal generation in the same Divinity and Majesty with himself: by which Paternity, coæval to the Deity, I acknowledge him always Father, as much as always God. And in this relation, I profess that eminency and priority, that as he is the original cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

I believe in God the Father Almighty.

AFTER the relation of God's Paternity, immediately followeth the glorious attribute of his Omnipotency [37]: that as those in heaven in their devotions, so we on earth in our confessions
Rev. iv. 8. might acknowledge that *Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come;* that in our solemn meetings at the Church of God, with the joint expression and concurring language of the congregation, we might some way imitate that
Rev. xix. 6. *voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth* [38].

This notion of *almighty* in the Creed must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament; and that cannot be better understood than by the Greek writers or interpreters of the Old, especially when the notion itself belongs unto the Gospel and the Law

[37] For the oldest and shortest Creed had always this attribute expressed in it. Insomuch that Παντοκράτωρ was ordinarily by the ancients taken for the Father, as *Orig. lib.* vii. *cont. Celsum.* [c. 10. vol. i. p. 700 E.] Ἐχρὴν δὲ αὐτὸν ——ἐκθέσθαι αὐταῖς λέξεσι τὰς προφητείας, εἴτ' ἐν αἷς Θεὸς Παντοκράτωρ ἐπηγγέλλετο εἶναι ὁ λέγων, εἴτ' ἐν αἷς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἴτ' ἐν αἷς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγον εἶναι ἐπιστεύετο. And according to this general confession did Polycarp begin his prayer at his martyrdom: Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατήρ. *Eccles. Smyrn. Epist.* [c. 14. Cotel. i. p. 200.]

[38] Οἱ παρρησίαν εἰληφότες τὸν παντοκράτορα Θεὸν πατέρα καλεῖν. *Constit. Apost. lib.* i. *Procem.* [Cotel. i. p. 202.]

indifferently. Now the word which we translate *almighty*[39] the most ancient Greek interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, *the Lord of Hosts*, sometimes for his name *Shaddai*, as gene-
42 rally in the book of Job: by the first they seem to signify the rule and dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power by which he is able to perform all things. *The heavens and the earth were finished*, saith Moses, *and* Gen. ii. 1.
all the host of them: and he which begun them, he which finished them, is the Ruler and Commander of them. Upon the right of creation doth he justly challenge this dominion. *I have made the* Isa. xlv. 12.
earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded. And on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of *the Lord of Hosts:* Κύριος Σαβαώθ.
which, though preserved in the original language[40] both by St. Paul and St. James, yet by St. John is turned into that word which we translate *almighty*. Wherefore from the use of the sacred Writers, from the notation[41] of the word in Greek, and

39 Παντοκράτωρ, translated by Tertullian and St. Augustin, *Omnitenens*, (as Tertullian translates κοσμοκράτορας, *munditenentes*,) by Prudentius, *Omnipollens*, by all, *Omnipotens*, (as St. Hilary translated κοσμοκράτορας, *mundipotentes*,) and, as I conceive, it is translated, *capax universorum*, by the Latin interpreter of Hermas. 'Primum omnium credere quod unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit, et consummavit, et ex nihilo omnia fecit. Ipse capax universorum, solus immensus est.' *lib.* ii. *Mand.* 1. [Cotel. i. p. 85.] Which, by the interpreter of Irenæus, is thus translated, 'Omnium capax, et qui a nemine capiatur.' *lib.* iv. *cap.* 37. [c. 20. §. 2. p. 253.]

40 Εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα. Rom. ix. 29. the words of Isai. i. 9. Καὶ αἱ βοαὶ τῶν θερισάντων εἰς τὰ ὦτα Κυρίου Σαβαὼθ εἰσεληλύθασιν. Jam. v. 4. which are the words of St. James in relation to Deut. xxiv. 15. Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. iv. 8. which were before in Isaiah; Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ. Isai. vi. 3. Τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἐροῦμεν καὶ περὶ τῆς Σαβαὼθ φωνῆς, πολλαχοῦ τῶν ἐπῳδῶν παραλαμβανομένης· ὅτι εἰ μεταλαμβάνομεν τὸ ὄνομα εἰς τὸ Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, ἢ Κύριος στρατιῶν, ἢ παντοκράτωρ, (διαφόρως γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐξεδέξαντο οἱ ἑρμηνεύοντες αὐτὸ) οὐδὲν ποιήσομεν. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* v. [c. 45. vol. i. p. 613 A.]

41 That Παντοκράτωρ should have the signification of government in it, according to the composition in the Greek language, no man can doubt, who but only considers those vulgar terms of their politics, δημοκρατία and ἀριστοκρατία, from whence it appears that μοναρχία and in that sense αὐτοκράτωρ is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman emperor, as not only the later historians, but even the coins of Julius Cæsar, witness. *Hesych.* Αὐτοκράτωρ, αὐτεξούσιος ἢ κοσμοκράτωρ, because the Roman emperor was ruler of the known world. So the devils or princes of the air are termed by St. Paul, κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. vi. 12. which is all one with ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου, as will appear, John xii. 31. and xiv. 30. and xvi. 11. As therefore Κράτος signifieth of itself rule and authority, *Hesych.* Κράτος, βασιλεία, ἐξουσία· Κράτει, ἀρχῇ, ἐξουσία· to which sense Eustathius hath observed Homer led the following writers by those words of his,—

Σὸν δὲ κράτος αἰὲν ἀέξειν. Ἰλ. μ'. 214.
Τὸ μὲν κράτος συλλαμβάνεταί τι τοῖς ὕστερον τὴν βασιλείαν κράτος λέγουσι· whence Æschylus calls Agamemnon

from the testimony of the ancient Fathers [42], we may well ascribe unto God the Father, in the explication of this Article, the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

Ἐξουσία. This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the sacred Scriptures; from whence those names [43] or titles which most aptly and fully express dominion, are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that natural and eternal right of dominion.

Luke xii. 5. Acts i. 7. Jude 25. Rev. v. 13.

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or branches of it; the first whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedom of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the Lord and Master of them, by virtue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using and disposing all things

and Menelaus δίθρονον κράτος Ἀχαιῶν, and Sophocles after him, δικρατεῖς Ἀτρείδας· and as κρατεῖν, to *rule* or *govern*, (Κρατεῖ, κυριεύει, ἄρχει· from whence Κρατὺς, ἄρχων, ἐξουσιάζων·) so also in composition, παντοκράτωρ, *the ruler of all*. Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ θεὸς, πάντων κρατῶν. *Hesych.* Παντοκρατορία, πανταρχία. *Suid.*

42 Αἱρετικοὶ—οὐκ οἴδασιν ἕνα παντοκράτορα θεόν. Παντοκράτωρ γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πάντων κρατῶν, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς δεσπότην, τὸν δέ τινα τοῦ σώματος, οὐδέτερον αὐτῶν τέλειον λέγουσι, τῷ λείπειν ἑκάτερον θατέρῳ. Ὁ γὰρ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, σώματος δὲ ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; καὶ ὁ δεσπόζων σωμάτων, μὴ ἐξουσιάζων δὲ πνευμάτων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* VIII. [§. 3. p. 122 A.] Ὡς γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ἰσχυρότατον τῶν στοιχείων, καὶ πάντων κρατοῦν, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς παντοδύναμος καὶ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ δυνάμενος κρατῆσαι, κτίσαι, ποιῆσαι, τρέφειν, αὔξειν, σώζειν, σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. *Theodotus apud Clem. Alex. ex Script. Prophet. Eclog. cap.* 26. [vol. ii. p. 996.] 'Unus est Dominus Jesus Christus per quem Deus Pater dominatum omnium tenet; unde et sequens sermo Omnipotentem pronunciat Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo esse dicitur, quod omnium ille teneat potentatum.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 5. p. ccii.]*

43 As אדוני *κύριος, δεσπότης.* Ἓν μὲν τὸ κυρίως καὶ πρώτως ὄν, οὗ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ πάντα, καὶ ὃς ἁπάντων δεσπόζει· Τὰ γὰρ σύμπαντα δοῦλά σα. *Phot. Epist.* 162. [p. 215.]

* [The word *Almighty* conveys three ideas; that God is omnipotent, his dominion universal, and his essence infinite. It was necessary to assert these three points against the Gnostics, who believed that God had not the power of creating matter; who gave the title of Cosmocrator, or Ruler of the world, to an inferior being, or emanation from God; and who believed that God did not exceed the limits of the Pleroma. See King on the Creed, p. 82, &c. Barrow says that the word may import either right and authority over all, *omnipotestas;* or power and ability to do all things, *omnipotentia;* or actual exercise of such authority and power, in ruling and disposing all things, *omnipotentatus;* also the possession or holding all things, *omnitenentia;* and the preservation or upholding all things, *omnicontinentia*. Works, vol. vi. p. 177.]

so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention only for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. God's actual dominion being no otherways necessary, than upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this Almighty, is farther to be considered in the independency and infinity of it. First, it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the original, and the use thereof. For God hath received no
43 authority from any, because he hath all power originally in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it; as being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the *God of Gods*, is also the *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, the only Potentate;* because he alone hath all the power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

Deut. x. 17. Ps. cxxxvi. 3. 1 Tim. vi. 15. μόνος δυνάστης. Sap. Syr. xlvi. 5. ὕψιστος δυνάστης. 2 Mac. xv. 29. ὁ δυνάστης. v. 23. δυνάστης τῶν οὐρανῶν. iii. 24. ὁ τῶν πατέρων κύριος, καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης. Ὕπατος κρειόντων. Ἰλ. θ'. 13. Dan. v. 23. Josh. iii. 11. 13. Ps. xcvii. 5. Mic. iv. 13. Zech. iv. 14. and vi. 5. Matt. xi. 25. Acts xvii. 24. Deut. x. 14.

The infinity of God's dominion, if we respect the object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the object is sufficiently evidenced by these appellations which the holy writ ascribeth unto the Almighty, calling him the *Lord of heaven*, the *Lord of the whole earth*, the *Lord of heaven and earth;* under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moses taught the distrusting Israelites in the wilderness: *Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God, the earth also with all that is therein.* With these words David glorifieth God: *The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine;* so acknowledging his dominion; *as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them:* so expressing the foundation or ground of that dominion. And yet more fully at the dedication of the offerings for the building of the Temple, to shew that what they gave was of his own, he saith, *Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine.*

Ps. lxxxix. 11. 1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12. מושל בכל xxix. 14. כי־ממך הכל.

Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all[44]. If then we look upon the object of God's dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things: so that nothing can be imagined which is not his, belonging to him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to his will as the sole governor and disposer: in respect of which universal power we must confess him to be Almighty.

If we consider the manner and nature of this power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear; for as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intension*, he hath all power over every thing, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he cate-

Jer. xviii. 6. chised the Prophet Jeremy in a potter's house, saying, *O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel.* That is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdom on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposal of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his

Rom. ix. 21. free, but wise and just, decrees. *Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?* And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother potsherd (both being made of the same metal) than God hath over him, who, by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that?

The duration of God's dominion must likewise necessarily be eternal, if any thing which is be immortal. For, being every thing is therefore his, because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production; it followeth that so long as it is continued, it must be his, and consequently, being some of his creatures are immortal, his dominion must be eternal. Wherefore St. Paul 44 expressly calleth God *the King eternal*, with reference to that of

1 Tim. i. 17. Τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων.

44 Πάντη γὰρ πάντα τοῖς θεοῖς ὕποχα, καὶ πανταχῇ πάντων ἴσον οἱ θεοὶ κρατοῦσι. *Xenoph. de Exped. Cyr. lib.* ii. [5. 2.] [c. 5. §. 7.]

* [The modern editions had *intention*. I have restored *intension*, as in the first and fourth editions. So Jeremy Taylor, "Faith differs from Hope, in the exten-"sion of its object, and in the intension of degree," as it is rightly quoted by Johnson, though altered in Heber's edition, vol. iv. p. 185.]

David, *Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* And Moses in his Song hath told us, *The Lord shall reign for ever and ever:* which phrase *for ever and ever* in the original signifieth thus much, that there is no time to come assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

Ps. cxlv. 13. מלכות כל־עלמים LXX. βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων. Ex. xv. 18. לעלם ועד LXX. ἐπ' αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. S. Hier. *in seculum et ultra.* So Aquila, Theod. and the fifth edit. in Ps. xxi. 4. So the LXX. again. Dan. xii. 7. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ ἔτι· and Mic. iv. 5. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα.

The third branch of God's authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by virtue of his absolute dominion. For it is the general dictate of reason, that the use, benefit, and utility of any thing redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the proprietor it belongeth. 'Tis true indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his original felicity, cannot receive any real benefit and utility from the creature. *Thou art my Lord,* saith David, *my goodness extendeth not to thee*[45]: and therefore our only and absolute Lord, because his goodness extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for our benefit, not for his own: for us who want, and therefore may receive; not for himself, who cannot receive, because he wanteth nothing, whose honour standeth not in his own, but in our receiving[46].

Ps. xvi. 2.

But though the universal Cause made all things for the benefit of some creatures framed by him, yet hath he made them ultimately for himself; and God is as universally the final as the efficient cause of his operations. The Apostle hath taught us, that not only *of him,* and *by him,* as the first Author, but also *to him,* and *for him,* as the ultimate end, *are all things.* And 'tis one of the proverbial sentences of Solomon, *The Lord hath made*

Rom. xi. 36. Heb. ii. 10. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Prov. xvi. 4.

45 'Ille nostra servitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus, ut operetur et custodiat nos: et ideo verus solus est Dominus, quia non illi ad suam sed ad nostram utilitatem salutemque servimus. Nam si nobis indigeret, eo ipso non verus Dominus esset, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur necessitas, sub qua et ipse serviret.' S. *August. de Gen. ad lit. lib.* viii. *cap.* 11. [§. 24. vol. iii. part 1. p. 234 D.] '*Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu:* quare? *quoniam bonorum meorum non eges.* Ille non eget nostri, nos egemus ipsius; ideo verus Dominus. Nam tu non valde verus dominus servi tui; ambo homines, ambo egentes Deo. Si autem putas egere tui servum tuum, ut des panem, eges et tu servi tui, ut adjuvet labores tuos. Uterque vestrum altero vestrum indiget: itaque nullus vestrum vere dominus, et nullus vestrum vere servus; Audi verum Dominum, cujus verus es servus, *Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu;* quare tu Dominus? *quoniam bonorum meorum non eges.*' *Idem, ad Psal.* lxix. [§. 7. vol. iv. p. 717 B.]

46 Τιμὴν ποιεῖται τοῦ ἀνενδεοῦς τὴν τῶν ἀπ' ἐκείνου προτεινομένων ἀγαθῶν ὑποδοχήν. *Hierocl. in Aur. Carm.* [p. 22.] And again, Ὅστις τιμᾷ τὸν Θεὸν ὡς προσδεόμενον, οὗτος λέληθεν οἰόμενος ἑαυτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι κρείττονα.

all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil. For though he cannot receive any real benefit or utility from the creature, yet he can and doth in a manner receive that which
Ps. civ. 31. hath some similitude or affinity with it. Thus God rejoiceth at the effects of his wisdom, power, and goodness, and taketh delight in the works of his hands. Thus doth he order and dispose of all things unto his own glory, which redoundeth from the demonstration of his attributes.

An explicit belief of this authoritative power and absolute dominion of the Almighty is necessary, first for the breeding in us an awful reverence of his majesty, and entire subjection to his will. For to the highest excellency the greatest honour, to the supreme authority the most exact obedience is no more than duty[47]. If God be our absolute Lord, we his servants and vassals, then is there a right in him to require of us whatsoever we can perform, and an obligation upon us to perform whatsoever he commandeth[48]. Whosoever doth otherwise, while he confesseth, denieth him; while he acknowledgeth him with his
Luke vi. 46. tongue, he sets his hand against him. *Why call ye me Lord, Lord,* saith our Saviour, *and do not the things which I say?*

Secondly, This belief is also necessary to breed in us equanimity and patience in our sufferings, to prevent all murmuring, repining, and objecting against the actions or determinations of 45
God, as knowing that he, who is absolute Lord, cannot abuse his power; he, whose will is a law to us, cannot do any thing
Isa. xlv. 9. unwisely or unjustly. *Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth: shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?* But let the man after God's own heart rather
Ps. xxxix. 9. teach us humble and religious silence. *I was dumb,* saith he, *and opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.* When Shimei cast stones at him, and cursed him, let us learn to speak as he
2 Sam. xvi. 10. then spake: *The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David: who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?*

Thirdly, The belief of God's absolute dominion is yet further necessary to make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from him, so as by a right value and estimation

47 Ἡμεῖς δὲ μεγάλοιο Διὸς πειθώμεθα βουλῇ,
Ὅς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει. *Hom.* Ἰλ. μ'. 241.

48 Ἐμοὶ πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ καταφυγὴ καὶ νόμος
Καὶ τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ τ' ἀδίκου παντὸς κριτής
Ὁ δεσπότης· πρὸς τοῦτον ἕνα δεῖ ζῆν ἐμέ.
Servus apud Menand. [Stobæus, Flor. tit. lxii. 38.]

of them to understand how far we stand obliged to him. No man can duly prize the blessings of Heaven, but he which acknowledgeth they might justly have been denied him; nor can any be sufficiently thankful for them, except it be confessed that he owed him nothing who bestowed them.

But as the original word for *almighty* is not put only for the *Lord of Hosts*, but often also for the *Lord Shaddai:* so we must not restrain the signification to the power authoritative, but extend it also to that power which is properly operative and executive. In the title of the *Lord of Sabaoth* we understand the rule and dominion of God, by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name *Shaddai* we apprehend an infinite force and strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in composition[49], as signifying the *all-sufficient;* whosoever is able to suppeditate all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the root[50] denoting *vastation* or *destruction;* whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of *almighty* necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of God's dominion speaketh him infinitely powerful in operation[51]. Indeed in earthly dominions, the strength of the governor is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: and he is a powerful prince whose subjects are numerous. But the King of kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a nation in the person of the king, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could rebellion be successful: whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant

49 So R. Solomon [Rashi on Gen. xvii. 1.] will have it compounded of ש the pronoun, and שי, די, [אני הוא] באלהותי לכל בריה: *because in God there is sufficiency,* that is, sufficient power, *over every creature:* from whence the LXX. Ruth i. 20, 21. Job xxi. 15. and xxxi. 2. translate it *ἱκανός*, as Symmachus, Job xxii. 3. and Aquila with him, Ezek. i. 24.

50 שדד *vastavit, destruxit, perdidit:* from whence שדי *the destroyer;* and because utter destruction requireth power equivalent to production, *the Omnipotent,* from whence the LXX. Job viii. 3. translate it, *ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας.* And this etymology, rather than the former, seemeth to be confirmed by the Prophet, Isa. xiii. 6. *Howl ye, for the day of the Lord is at hand,* כשד משדי יבוא: *It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty* (*destroyer*).

51 Homer hath well joined these two:

Ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε, Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρειόντων,
Εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὅ τοι σθένος οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν. Ἰλ. θ'. 31.

prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people hath taken the boldness to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the Governor of the world ruleth only over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yoke with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible. For man is not more inclinable to obey God than man, but God is more powerful to exact subjection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him Almighty: and so, according to the most vulgar acception, give the second explication of his Omnipotency [52].

But because this word *almighty* [53] is twice repeated in the 46
Creed, once in this first Article and again in the sixth, where Christ is represented *sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty;* and although in our English and the Latin the same word be expressed in both places, yet in the ancient Greek copies there is a manifest distinction; being the word in the first Article may equally comprehend God's power in operation, as well as authority in dominion; whereas that in the sixth speaketh only infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I shall therefore reserve the explication of the latter unto its proper place, designing to treat particularly of God's infinite power where it is most peculiarly expressed; and so conclude briefly with two other interpretations, which some of the ancients have made of the original word, belonging rather to philosophy than divinity, though true in both. For some [54] have stretched this word *almighty*, according to the Greek notation, to signify that God holdeth, incircleth, and containeth all things. *Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the*

Prov. xxx. 4.

52 'Hoc nisi credamus, periclitatur ipsum nostræ Confessionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim ob aliud veraciter vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quoniam quidquid vult potest, nec voluntate cujuspiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 96. [§. 24. vol. vi. p. 231 F.]

53 *Art.* 1. Πιστεύω εἰς θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα. *Art.* 6. Καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ πατρὸς παντοδυνάμου, as it is in the ancient copy of the Creed taken out of the library of Bene't College, and set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh.

54 As Theophilus Bishop of Antioch, giving account of those words which are attributed unto God, as Θεὸς, κύριος, ὕψιστος, tells us he is called Παντοκράτωρ, ὅτι αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα κρατεῖ καὶ ἐμπεριέχει. τὰ γὰρ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τὰ βάθη τῶν ἀβύσσων, καὶ τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν. *Ad Autol. lib.* i. [§. 4. p. 340 C.]

earth? who but God? *Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure?* who but he? Thus then may he be called *almighty*, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things. Isa. xl. 12.

Others [55] extend it farther yet, beyond that of containing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of sustaining or preservation. For the same power which first gave being unto all things, continueth the same being unto all. *God giveth to all life, and breath, and all things. In him we live, move, and have our being*, saith the strangest Philosopher that ever entered Athens, the first expositor of that blind inscription, *To the unknown God. How could any thing have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved, if not called by thee?* as the wisdom of the Jews confesseth. Thus did the Levites stand and bless: *Thou, even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all.* Where the continual conservation of the creature is in an equal latitude attributed unto God with their first production. Because there is as absolute a necessity of preserving us from returning unto nothing by annihilation, as there was for first bestowing an existence on us by creation. And in this sense God is undoubtedly almighty, in that he doth sustain, uphold, and constantly preserve all things in that being which they have. Acts xvii. 25, 28. Wisd. xi. 25. Neh. ix. 6.

From whence we may at last declare what is couched under this attribute of God, how far this Omnipotency extends itself, and what every Christian is thought to profess, when he addeth this part of the first Article of his Creed, *I believe in God the Father ALMIGHTY.*

As I am persuaded of an infinite and independent Essence, which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternal generation by which that God is a Father; so I assure myself that Father

55 As Gregorius Nyssenus, Οὐκοῦν ὅταν τῆς Παντοκράτωρ φωνῆς ἀκούσωμεν, τοῦτο νοοῦμεν, τὰ πάντα τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ εἶναι συνέχειν. [contra Eunom. Or. ii. vol. ii. p. 467 D.] Neither, says he, would God be termed Παντοκράτωρ, εἰ μὴ πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τοῦ περικρατοῦντος αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐν τῷ εἶναι συντηροῦντος, ἐδέετο. *Cont. Eunom. lib.* i. [ibid. p. 467 C.] 'Creatoris namque potentia, et Omnipotentis atque Omnitenentis virtus, causa subsistendi est omni creaturæ. Quæ virtus ab eis quæ creata sunt regendis si aliquando cessaret, simul et illorum cessaret species, omnisque natura concideret.' *S. August. in Genes. ad lit. lib.* iv. *cap.* 12. [§. 22. vol. iii. part 1. p. 167 E.]

is not subject to infirmities of age, nor is there any weakness attending on the *Ancient of days;* but, on the contrary, I believe Omnipotency to be an essential attribute of his Deity, and that not only in respect of operative and active power, (concerning which I shall have occasion to express my faith hereafter,) but also in regard of power authoritative, in which I must acknowledge his antecedent and eternal right of making what, and when, 47
and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its independency, both in the original, and the use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternal without end or conclusion. Thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

Maker of Heaven and Earth.

ALTHOUGH this last part of the first Article were not expressed in the ancient Creeds[56], yet the sense thereof was delivered in the first Rules of Faith[57], and at last these parti-

[56] For we find it not mentioned by St. Augustin, *de Fide et Symbolo;* neither hath Ruffinus expounded it in the Aquileian, or noted it to be found in the Roman or Oriental Creeds. Leo, reciting the three first Articles in his Epistle to Flavianus, maketh no mention of it. [Ep. xxiv. vol. i. p. 479.] Maximus Taurinensis hath it not in *Traditione Symboli,* nor Petrus Chrysologus in his Sermons, amongst six several expositions. It is not in the Homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus, or the exposition of Venantius Fortunatus. Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra left it not at Rome with Julius; nor did Arius in his Catholic Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it: neither are the words to be found in the Latin or Greek copy of the Creed written about the beginning of the eighth century, and published out of the MSS. by the most reverend and learned Archbishop of Armagh; or in that which Etherius and Beatus produced against Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh century.

[57] As in that delivered by Irenæus, Εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. *Adv. Hær. lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [I. 10. 1. p. 48.] and that by Tertullian, 'Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit.' *De præscr. adv. Hær. cap.* 13. [p. 206 D.] and that under the name of Novatian, not in formal words, but with an *id est,* by way of explication; 'Regula exigit veritatis ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem, qui cœlum alta sublimitate suspenderit, terram dejecta mole solidavit, maria soluto liquore diffuderit, et hæc omnia propriis et condignis instrumentis et ornata et plena digesserit.' *De Trin. cap.* 1. [p. 706 A.] It was also observed by Origen, that the Christians were wont most

enlar words inserted both in the Greek and Latin Confessions. And indeed the work of Creation most properly followeth the attribute of Omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is *a God,* and that God *Almighty;* as we acknowledge that same *God* to be the *Father* of our Lord *Jesus Christ,* and in him of us: so we also confess that the same *God* the *Father made* both *heaven and earth.* For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first, to declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the terms of *heaven and earth;* secondly, to express the nature of the action, the true notion of Creation, by which they were made; and thirdly, to demonstrate the Person to whom this operation is ascribed.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the Creed, that under the terms of *heaven and earth* are comprehended all things; because the first rules of Faith did so express it, and the most ancient Creeds had either, instead of these words, or together with them, *the Maker of all things visible and invisible,* which being terms of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universal comprehension; nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible or invisible. Being then these were the words of the Nicene Creed; being the addition of *heaven and earth* in the Constantinopolitan could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;* it followeth, that they which in the Latin Church made use only of this last addition, could not choose but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

48 And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the

frequently to mention God under that as the most common title; Ἡ γὰρ ἀορίστως ὁμολογοῦσι τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα, τὸ, ὁ Θεὸς, ἢ καὶ μετὰ προσθήκης τῆς, ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων, ὁ ποιητὴς οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς. *Cont. Cels. lib.* i. [c. 25. vol. i. p. 343 E.] Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· [apud Socrat. i. 8. p. 23.] and that Council expressed the same without alteration in their Creed. But after the Nicene Council we find added ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechism, [cat. ix. p. 126 A.] and Epiphanius in *Ancorato:* [§. 120. vol. ii. p. 122 C.] which addition was received, confirmed, and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we find this Article thus expressed in the Western Confessions, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli et terræ.*

Creed, because it is the known language of the sacred Scriptures. Exod. xxxi. 17. *In six days*, saith Moses, *the Lord made heaven and earth:* in the same time, saith God himself, *the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.* Exod. xx. 11. So that all things by those two must be understood which are contained in them: and we know no being which is made or placed without them. When God would call a general rendezvous, and make up an universal auditory, the Prophet cries out, *Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth.* Isa. i. 2. When he would express the full splendour of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actual dominion, *Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool.* Isa. lxvi. 1. When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of Immensity and Omnipresence, *Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.* Jer. xxiii. 24. These two then taken together signify the Universe, or that which is called the World. St. Paul hath given a clear exposition of these words in his explication of the Athenian altar; *God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.* Acts xvii. 24. For being God is necessarily the Lord of all things which he made, (the right of his direct dominion being clearly grounded upon the first Creation,) except we should conceive the Apostle to exempt some creature from the authoritative power of God, and to take some work of his hand out of the reach of his arm; we must confess that *heaven and earth* are of as large extent and ample signification as the *world and all things therein.* Where it is yet farther observable, that the Apostle hath conjoined the speech of both Testaments together. For the ancient Hebrews seem to have had no word in use among them which singly of itself did signify the World, as the Greeks had, in whose language St. Paul did speak; and therefore they used in conjunction the *heaven and earth,* as the grand extremities within which all things are contained [58]. Nay, if we take the expositions of the later writers in that language, those two words will not only as extremities comprehend between them, but in

58 Καλῶς δὲ πάντες σχεδὸν ἐξεδέξαντο τοῖς ἄκροις, οὐρανῷ τε καὶ γῇ, τὰ μέσα συμπεριειληφέναι στοιχεῖα.—πῶς δὲ ἄκρα φημί; ὅτι γῆ μὲν τὸ κέντρον παντὸς ἐμπεριείληφε. καὶ ἔστι κάτωθεν μὲν ἀρχὴ πάντων ἡ γῆ, πέρας δὲ τούτων ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανός· τοὔμπαλιν δὲ ἄνωθεν, ἀρχὴ μὲν ὁ οὐρανὸς, πέρας δὲ πάντων ἡ γῆ· μετὰ δὲ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ λοιπὰ τρία περιείληπται στοιχεῖα. *Jo. Philop. de Mundi Creat. lib.* i. *cap.* 5. [Galland. xii. p. 478 B.] Τῷ μὲν οὐρανίῳ σώματι (ἡ φύσις) τὸ πέριξ τοῦ παντὸς ἀπένειμε· τῷ δὲ περιγείῳ τὸ κέντρον· ἐν δὲ σφαίρᾳ ἄλλως μὲν τὸ κέντρον ἀρχὴ, ἄλλως δὲ ὁ τοῦ περιέχοντος ὅρος. *Hierocl. in Aur. Carm.* [v. 52. p. 180.]

the extension of their own significations contain all things in them. For when they divide the universe into three worlds[59], the inferior, superior, and the middle world; the lower is wholly contained in the name of *earth*, the other two under the name of *heaven*. Nor do the Hebrews only use this manner of expression, but even the Greeks themselves; and that not only before, but after[60] Pythagoras[61] had accustomed them to one name. As therefore under the single name of World or Universe[62], so also under the conjunctive expression of *heaven and earth*, are contained all things material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

49 But as the Apostle hath taught us to reason, *When he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him:* so when we say, all things were made by God, it is as manifest that he is excepted who made all things. And then the proposition is clearly thus delivered; all beings whatsoever beside God were made. As we read in St. John concerning the *Word*, that *the world was made by him;* and in more plain and express words before, *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Which is yet farther illustrated by St. Paul: *For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in*

1 Cor. xv. 27.

John i. 10.

Ver. 3.

Col. i. 16.

59 For the Rabbins usually divide the whole frame of things into שלש עולמות *three worlds:* the first, עולם התחתון *the inferior*, or עולם השפל *the depressed* and lowest *world;* הוא זה עולם *that is this world*, say they, to wit, this globe of earth on which we live. This they divide into three parts; ים *the sea*, lakes and rivers, מדבר *the desert*, solitary and inhabitable* places, רחוק מן הישוב *far from the habitations of men*, and ישוב *τὴν οἰκουμένην, the earth inhabited.* The second is called עולם התיכון *the middle* or *inmost world;* הוא עולם הגלגלים *this is the world of the spheres*, containing the aërial region, and the starry heavens. The third is, עולם העליון *the superior world;* הוא עולם המלאכים *this is the world of angels*, אלהים *of God*, נפשות *of souls*, עולם הרוחני *the spiritual world.* [Buxtorf. Lex. Rabb. sub עולם.] Now being these three comprehend all things imaginable; being the first is sufficiently expressed in ארץ *the earth*, and the two last in שמים *the heaven;* it followeth that, in the sense of the Hebrews, *heaven and earth* signify all things.

60 Εἷς, *ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἷς ἐστὶν θεός,*
Ὃς οὐρανὸν τέτευχε καὶ γαῖαν μακράν.
Sophocl. apud Just. Mart. Clem. Alex. &c.

61 Πυθαγόρας *πρῶτος ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν ὅλων περιοχήν, κόσμον, ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τάξεως. Plutarch. de Plac. Philosoph. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1. [p. 886 B.]

62 'Si *mundum* dixeris, illic erit et cœlum, et quæ in eo, sol, et luna, et sidera, et astra, et terra, et freta, omnis census elementorum. Omnia dixeris, cum id dixeris quod ex omnibus constat.' *Tertul. de Virg. Veland. cap.* 4. [p. 175 B.] Φασὶ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ οὐρανὸν *καὶ γῆν καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους τὴν κοινωνίαν συνέχειν, καὶ φιλίαν, καὶ κοσμιότητα, καὶ σωφροσύνην, καὶ δικαιότητα· καὶ τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλοῦσιν. Iambl. Protrept.* [c. xix.] but the words are Plato's *in Gorgia.* [p. 507.]

* [This word would now be written *uninhabitable.*]

earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him. If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God.

This then is the unquestionable doctrine of the Christian Faith, That the vast capacious frame of the world, and every thing any way contained and existing in it, hath not its essence from or of itself, nor is of existence absolutely necessary; but what it is, it hath not been, and that being which it hath was
Heb. iii. 4. made, framed, and constituted by another. And as *every house is builded by some man;* for we see the earth bear no such creature of itself; stones do not grow into a wall, or first hew and square, then unite and fasten themselves together in their generation; trees sprout not cross-like dry and sapless beams, nor do spars and tiles spring with a natural uniformity into a roof, and that out of stone and mortar: these are not the works of Nature, but superstructions and additions to her, as the supplies of art, and the testimonies of the understanding of man, the great artificer on earth: so if the world itself be but an house[63],
Job xxvi. 7. if the earth, which *hangeth upon nothing*, be the foundation, and the glorious spheres of heaven the roof, (which hath been delivered as the most universal hypothesis,) if this be the habitation of an infinite Intelligence, the Temple[64] of God; then must we acknowledge the world was built by him, and, conse-
Heb. iii. 4. quently, that *he which built all things is God.*

From hence appears the truth of that distinction, Whatsoever hath any being, is either made or not made: whatsoever is not made, is God; whatsoever is not God, is made. One uncreated and independent Essence; all other depending on it, and created by it. One of eternal and necessary existence; all other indifferent, in respect of actual existing, either to be or not to be, and that indifferency determined only by the free and voluntary act of the first Cause.

Now because to be thus made includes some imperfection,

63 Ὁ αἰσθητὸς οὑτοσὶ κόσμος οὐδὲν ἄρα ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ οἶκος θεοῦ. *Philo de Insomn.* [vol. i. p. 648.] Κόσμος εὐπρεπὴς καὶ ἕτοιμος, αἰσθητὸς οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. *Idem, de Plant. Noe.* [vol. i. p. 337.] Θεῖόν τι μέγεθος ὁ κόσμος, καὶ οἶκος θεοῦ αἰσθητός. *Idem, de Mundi Incorr.* [vol. ii. p. 509.]

64 Lucretius calls the heavens,
—*Mundi magnum et versatile templum.*
De Rer. Nat. lib. v. ver. 1435.
Τὸ ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ νομίζειν τὸν σύμπαντα χρὴ κόσμον εἶναι. *Philo de Monarch.* [lib. ii. vol. ii. p. 222.]

and among the parts of the world some are more glorious than others; if those which are most perfect presuppose a Maker, then can we not doubt of a creation where we find far less perfection. This house of God, though uniform, yet is not all of the same materials, the footstool and the throne are not of the same mould; there is a vast difference between the heavenly expansions. This first aerial heaven, where God setteth up his pavilion, where *he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind*, is not so far inferior in place as it is in glory to the next, the seat of the sun and moon, the two great lights, and stars innumerable, far greater than the one of them. And yet that second heaven is not so far above the first as beneath the third, into which St. Paul was caught. The brightness of the sun doth not so far surpass the blackness of a wandering cloud, as the glory of that Heaven of presence surmounts the fading beauty of the starry firmament. For in this great Temple of the World, in which the Son of God is the High Priest, the Heaven which we see is but the Veil, and that which is above, the Holy of Holies. This Veil indeed is rich and glorious, but one day to be rent, and then to admit us into a far greater glory, even to the Mercy-seat and Cherubins. For this third Heaven is the *proper habitation* of the blessed Angels, which constantly attend upon the Throne. And if those most glorious and happy spirits, those *morning stars* which *sang together*, those *sons of God* which *shouted for joy* when *the foundations of the earth were laid*, if they and their habitation were made; then can we no ways doubt of the production of all other creatures, so much inferior unto them.

Ps. civ. 3.

2 Cor. xii. 2.

Ἴδιον οἰκητήριον. Jude 6.

Job xxxviii. 7, 4.

Forasmuch then as the Angels are termed the *sons of God*, it sufficiently denoteth that they are from him, not of themselves; all filiation inferring some kind of production: and being God hath but one proper and only-begotten Son, whose propriety and singularity consisteth in this, that he is of the same increated essence with the Father, all other offspring must be made, and consequently even the Angels created sons; of whom the Scripture speaking saith, *Who maketh his Angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire*. For although those words, as first spoken by the Psalmist, do rather express the nature of the wind and lightning: yet being the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews hath applied the same to the Angels properly so called, we cannot but conclude upon his authority, that the same God who

Ps. civ. 4.

Amos iv. 13. Job xxviii. 26.

created the wind, and *made a way for the lightning of the thunder,* hath also produced those glorious spirits; and as he furnished them with that activity there expressed, so did he frame the subject of it, their immaterial and immortal essence.

If then the angels and their proper habitation, the far most eminent and illustrious parts of the world, were made; if only to be made be one character of imperfection; much more must we acknowledge all things of inferior nature to have dependence on their universal Cause, and consequently this great universe, or all things, to be made, beside that one who made them.

This is the first part of our Christian Faith, against some of the ancient Philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined the Universe[65] to be infinite and eternal, and, what will follow from it, to be even God himself. It is true that the most ancient of the Heathen were not of this opinion, but all the Philosophy for many ages delivered the world to have been made[66].

65 'Mundum, et hoc quod nomine alio cœlum appellare libuit, cujus circumflexu teguntur cuncta, numen esse credi par est, æternum, immensum, neque genitum, neque interiturum unquam.' *Plin. Nat. Hist. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1.

66 Γενόμενον μὲν οὖν ἅπαντες εἶναί φασιν, says Aristotle, *de Cœlo, lib.* i. *cap.* 10. [§. 2.] confessing it the general opinion that the world was made. Which was so ancient a tradition of all the first Philosophers, that from Linus, Musæus, Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod, and the rest, they all mention the original of the world, entitling their books, Κοσμογονία, or Θεογονία, or the like. Εἰσὶ γάρ τινες οἳ φασιν οὐθὲν ἀγένητον εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίγνεσθαι· γενόμενα δὲ, τὰ μὲν ἄφθαρτα διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ πάλιν φθείρεσθαι· μάλιστα μὲν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡσίοδον εἶτα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ πρῶτοι φυσιολογήσαντες, says Aristotle, *de Cœlo, lib.* iii. *cap.* 1. [§. 7.] In which words he manifestly attributes the doctrine of the creation of the world, not only to Hesiod, but to all the first natural philosophers: which learning, beginning with Prometheus the first professor of that science, continued in that family amongst the Atlantiadæ, who all successively delivered that truth. After them the Ionian philosophy did acknowledge it, and the Italian received it by Pythagoras, whose scholars all maintained it beside Ocellus Lucanus, the first of them that fancied the world not made, whom Plato, though he much esteemed him, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident than that he held the world was made. Λέγωμεν δὴ, δι' ἥντινα αἰτίαν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τόδε ὁ ξυνιστὰς ξυνέστησεν· ἀγαθὸς ἦν. [Plato. Timæus, p. 29 D.] In which words he delivers not only the generation of the universe, but also the true cause thereof, which is the goodness of God. For he which asks this plain and clear question, Πότερον ἦν ἀεὶ, γενέσεως ἀρχὴν ἔχων οὐδεμίαν, ἢ γέγονεν, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τινος ἀρξάμενος; and answers the question briefly with a γέγονεν· [p. 28 B.] he which gives this general rule upon it, Τῷ δ' αὖ γενομένῳ φαμὲν ὑπ' αἰτίου τινὸς ἀνάγκην εἶναι γενέσθαι· and then immediately concludes, Τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν· [ibid.] cannot (notwithstanding all the shifts of his Greek expositors) be imagined to have conceived the world not made. And Aristotle, who best understood him, tells us clearly his opinion; Ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ, (from whence I cited the precedent

When this tradition of the creation of the world was delivered in all places down successively by those which seriously considered the frame of all things, and the difference of the most an-
51 cient Poets and Philosophers from Moses was only in the manner of expressing it; those which in after-ages first denied it, made use of very frivolous and inconcluding arguments, grounding their new opinion upon weak foundations.

For that which in the first place they take for granted as an axiom of undoubted truth, that *Whatsoever hath a beginning must have an end*[67], and consequently, *Whatsoever shall have no end had no beginning*, is grounded upon no general reason, but only upon particular observation of such things here below, as from the ordinary way of generation tend in some space of time unto corruption. From whence, seeing no tendency to corruption in several parts of the world, they conclude that it was never generated, nor had any cause or original of its being. Whereas, if we would speak properly, future existence or non-existence hath no such relation unto the first production. Neither is there any contradiction that at the same time one thing may begin to be, and last but for an hour, another continue for a thousand years, a third beginning at the same instant remain for ever: the difference being either in the nature of the things so made, or in the determinations of the will of him that made them. Notwithstanding then their universal rules, which are not true but in some limited particulars, it is most certain the whole world was made, and of it part shall perish, part continue unto all eternity; by which something which had a beginning shall have an end, and something not.

The second fallacy which led them to this novelty was the very name of *universe*, which comprehendeth in it all things; from whence they reasoned thus[68]: If the world or universe were made, then were all things made; and if the world shall be dissolved, then all things shall come to nothing: which is impossible. For if all things were made, then must either all, or at least something, have made itself, and so have been the cause

words,) ἐκεῖ γάρ φησι τὸν οὐρανὸν (where by the way observe that in Plato's Timæus οὐρανός and κόσμος are made synonymous) γενέσθαι μὲν, οὐ μὴν φθαρτόν. [de Cœlo, lib. i. cap. x. §. 12.]

67 Ocellus Lucanus, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως, which book Aristotle hath made use of, and transcribed in many parts.

68 Τό γε δὲ πᾶν γινόμενον σὺν πᾶσι γίνεται, καὶ τὸ φθειρόμενον σὺν πᾶσι φθείρεται· καὶ τοῦτό γε δὲ ἀδύνατον, ἄναρχον ἄρα καὶ ἀτελεύτητον τὸ πᾶν. *Ocell.* [c. i. §. 3. p. 7.]

of itself as of the effect, and the effect of itself as of the cause, and consequently in the same instant both have been and not been; which is a contradiction. But this fallacy is easily discovered: for when we say the Universe, or all things, were made, we must be always understood to except him who made all things, neither can we by that name be supposed to comprehend more than the frame of heaven and earth, and all things contained in them; and so he which first devised this argument hath himself acknowledged [69].

Far more gross was that third conceit, that if the world were ever made, it must be after the vulgar way of ordinary natural generations: in which two mutations are observable[70], the first from less to greater, or from worse to better; the second from greater to less, or from better to worse. (The beginning of the first mutation is called generation, the end of it perfection: the beginning of the second is from the same perfection, but concludeth in corruption or dissolution.) But none[71] hath ever yet observed that this frame of the world did ever grow up from less to greater, or improve itself from worse to better: nor can we now perceive that it becomes worse or less than it was, by which decretion we might guess at a former increase, and from a tendency to corruption collect its original generation. This conceit, I say, is far more gross. For certainly the argument so managed proves nothing at all, but only this, (if yet it prove so much,) that the whole frame of the world, and the parts thereof which are of greater perfection, were not generated in that manner in which we see some other parts of it are: which certainly no man denies. But that there can be no other way of production beside these petty generations, or that the world was 52
not some other way actually produced, this argument doth not endeavour to infer, nor can any other prove it.

69 Τὸ δέ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὀνομάζω τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον, διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας ἔτυχε ταύτης, ἐκ τῶν ἁπάντων δὴ κοσμηθείς. *Ocell.* [c. i. §. 8. p. 12.]

70 Πᾶν τὸ γενέσεως ἀρχὴν εἰληφὸς, καὶ διαλύσεως ὀφείλον κοινωνῆσαι, δύο ἐπιδέχεται μεταβολάς· μίαν μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μείονος ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον—δευτέραν δὲ τῆν ἀπὸ τοῦ μείζονος ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίονος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον—Ἐὰν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν γεννητόν ἐστι καὶ φθαρτὸν, γενόμενον, ἀπὸ τοῦ μείονος ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον μετέβαλε, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον. *Ocell.* [c. i. §. 4. p. 8.]

71 Τὸ δέ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρέχεται τεκμήριον τοιοῦτον· οὔτε γὰρ γενόμενον αὐτὸ εἴδομεν, οὔτε μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον καὶ τὸ μεῖζον μεταβάλλον, οὔτε χεῖρόν ποτε ἢ μεῖον γενόμενον· ἀλλ' ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὸ καὶ ὡσαύτως διατελεῖ, καὶ ἴσον καὶ ὅμοιον αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ. *Ocell.* [c. i. §. 6. p. 11.

The next foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their predecessors, was that general assertion, That it is impossible[72] for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing: from whence it will inevitably follow, that the matter of this world hath always been, and must always be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made: the second part before propounded for the exposition of this Article.

Now that the true nature and manner of this action may be so far understood as to declare the Christian Faith, and refute the errors of all opposers, it will be necessary to consider it first with reference to the Object or Effect; secondly, in relation to the Cause or Agent; thirdly, with respect unto the Time or Origination of it.

The action by which the Heaven and Earth were made, considered in reference to the effect, I conceive to be the production of their total being; so that whatsoever entity they had when made, had no real existence before they were so made. And this manner of production we usually term *creation*, as excluding all concurrence of any material cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as presupposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing[73]; that is, by which something is made, and not any thing preceding out of which it is made. This is the proper and peculiar sense of the word *creation:* not that it signifies so much by virtue of its origination or vulgar use in the Latin tongue[74]; nor that the Hebrew word used by Moses, *In the beginning God* created *the heaven and the earth*, hath of itself any such peculiar acception. For it is often used synonymously[75] with words which signify

72 Ἀμήχανον γὰρ τὸ ὂν ἀποτελέσθαι ἐκ τῶν μὴ ὄντων, ἢ εἰς τὸ μὴ ὂν ἀναλυθῆναι· ἄφθαρτον ἄρα καὶ ἀνώλεθρον τὸ πᾶν. *Ocell.* [c. i. p. 16.]

73 So I conceive it best expressed by Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury: 'Dicitur aliquid esse factum de nihilo, cum intelligimus esse quidem factum, sed non esse aliquid unde sit factum. *Monolog. cap.* 8. [p. 7 A.]

74 'Creatio apud nos *generatio* vel *nativitas* dicitur, apud Græcos vero sub nomine creationis verbum *facturæ* et *conditionis* accipitur.' *S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Eph. cap.* 4. [vol. vii. p. 626 E.]

75 ברא is promiscuously used with עשה, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effection, and with יצר, which rather implies a formation out of something, from whence יוצר *a potter*. For the first, we read Gen. ii. 3. that *God rested from all his work* אשר־ברא אלהים לעשות, not that on the sixth day he did the work of two days, that he might rest on the seventh, as Rabbi Solomon [on Gen. ii. 3, quoted from the Bereshit Rabba]; not that in six days he made the roots of things that they might afterward produce the like, as Aben Ezra [Comm. on Gen. ii. 3.]; not these or any other fancies of the Rabbins; as if ברא signified one

any kind of production or formation, and by itself it seldom denotes a production out of nothing, or proper creation, but most frequently the making of one substance out of another preexisting, as the fishes of the water, and man of the dust of the earth; the renovating or restoring any thing to its former perfection, for want of Hebrew words in composition; or, lastly, the doing some new or wonderful work[76], the producing some strange and admirable effect, as the opening the mouth of the earth, and the signal judgments on the people of Israel.

Gen. i. 21, 27. ii. 7. Psal. li. 10. Isa. lxv. 17. Numb. xvi. 30. Isa. xlv. 7.

We must not therefore weakly collect the true nature of creation from the force of any word which by some may be thought to express so much; but we must collect it from the testimony of God the Creator, in his word, and of the world created, in our reason*. The opinion of the church of the Jews will sufficiently appear in that zealous mother to her seventh and youngest son; *I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not:* which is a clear description of creation, that is, production out of nothing. But because this is not by all received as Canonical, we shall therefore evince it by the undoubted testimony of St. Paul, who expressing the nature of Abraham's faith, propoundeth *him whom he believed* as *God who quickeneth the dead,*

53

2 Mac. vii. 28.

Rom. iv. 17.

work, and עשה another; for they both express the production, as appears clearly in the following verse, *These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth,* בהבראם *when they were created,* ביום עשות *in the day that the Lord God made the heavens and the earth.* So Isa. xlv. 12. *I have made the earth, and created man upon it:* where the first expresseth the proper, the second the improper creation. Which indifferent acception appeareth in collating Psal. cxv. 15. and cxxi. 2. with Isa. xlii. 5. and xlv. 18. as also Isa. xvii. 7. with Eccl. xii. 1. From whence the LXX. translate ברא indifferently ποιεῖν or κτίζειν. For the second, יצר is usually rendered by the Targum ברא, and by the LXX. though generally πλάττειν, yet sometimes κτίζειν. And that it hath the same signification will appear by conferring Gen. ii. 7. with Isa. xlv. 12. and not only so, but by that single verse, Isa. xliii. 1. *Now thus saith the Lord,* בראך *that created thee, O Jacob,* ויצרך *and he that formed thee, O Israel.* Lastly, all these are jointly used in the same validity of expression, Isa. xliii. 7. *Every one that is called by my name: for* בראתיו *I have created him for my glory,* יצרתיו *I have formed him, yea* עשיתיו *I have made him.*

76 'Creatio atque conditio nunquam nisi in magnis operibus nominentur: verbi causa, mundus creatus est, urbs condita est, domus vero, quamvis magna sit, ædificata potius dicitur, quam condita vel creata. In magnis enim operibus atque facturis verbum creationis assumitur.' *S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Eph. cap.* 4. [vol. vii. p. 627 A.]

* [i. e. the word of God, or the scripture, will give us the testimony of God himself; our reason will enable us to collect another testimony from the material creation.

and calleth those things which be not, as though they were. For as *to be called* in the language of the Scripture is *to be,* (*Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God,* saith St. John in his Epistle, who in his Gospel told us, *he had given us power to become the sons of God:*) so *to call* is *to make,* or *cause to be.* As where the Prophet Jeremy saith, *Thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them,* the original may be thought to speak no more than this, *Thou hast caused this evil to them.* He therefore *calleth those things which be not, as if they were,* who maketh those things which were not, to be, and produceth that which hath a being out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This reason, generally persuasive unto Faith, is more peculiarly applied by the Apostle to the belief of the creation: for *through faith,* saith he, *we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.* Not as if the earth, which we see, were made of air; or any more subtil body, which we see not; nor as if those *things which are seen* were in equal latitude commensurable with the worlds which were framed: but that those *things which are seen,* that is, which are, were made of those *which did not appear*[77], that is, which were not.

1 John iii. 1. John i. 12. Jer. xxxii. 23. והקרא Heb. xi. 3.

Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter coeval with God as necessary for production of the world by way of subject, as the eternal and Almighty God by way of efficient. For if some real and material being must be presupposed by indispensable necessity, without which God could not cause any thing to be, then is not he independent in his actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity, which is contradictory to the divine perfection. Nor can any reason be alleged why he should be dependent in his operation, who is confessed independent in his being.

And as this coeternity of matter opposeth God's Independency, the proper notion of the Deity, so doth it also contradict his

77 For I take *μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων* in this place to be equivalent unto *οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων* in the Maccabees, and that of the same sense with *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων,* as the Syriac translation, מן אילין דלא מתחזין *ex iis quæ non conspiciuntur.* Which manner of speech may be observed even in the best Greek authors: as in Aristotle, *Nat. Auscult. lib.* v. *cap.* 2. §. 8. *Μεταβάλλοι ἂν τὸ μεταβάλλον τετραχῶς· ἢ γὰρ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκείμενον, ἢ οὐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς οὐχ ὑποκείμενον, ἢ μὴ ἐξ ὑποκείμενου εἰς ὑποκείμενον, ἢ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς μὴ ὑποκείμενον.* Where *οὐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου* is the same with *ἐξ οὐχ ὑποκειμένου,* and *μὴ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου* with *ἐξ μὴ ὑποκειμένου.* [In Bekker's edition there is a different reading of this passage.]

All-sufficiency. For if without the production of something beside himself he cannot make a demonstration of his attributes, or cause any sensibility of his power and will for the illustration of his own glory; and if without something distinct wholly from himself he cannot produce any thing, then must he want[78] something external: and whosoever wanteth any thing is not all-sufficient. And certainly he must have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternal God, who thinks he is no otherwise known to be Omnipotent than by the benefit of another[79]. Nor were the framers of the Creed so wise in prefixing the *Almighty* before *Maker of heaven and earth*, if, out 54
of a necessity of material concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather than omnipotency.

The supposition then of an eternal matter is so unnecessary where God works, and so derogatory to the infinity of his power, and all-sufficiency of himself, that the later Philosophers[80], something acquainted with the truth which we profess, though rejecting Christianity, have reproved those of the school of Plato, who delivered, as the doctrine of their master, an eternal companion, so injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

Wherefore to give an answer to that general position, that *out of nothing nothing can be produced*, which Aristotle[81] pretends to

78 'Nemo enim non eget eo de cujus utitur; nemo non subjicitur ei cujus eget, ut possit uti: sic et nemo de alieno utendo, non minor est eo de cujus utitur; et nemo qui præstat de suo uti, non in hoc superior est eo cui præstat uti.' *Tertul. adv. Hermog. cap.* 8. [p. 236 A.]

79 'Grande revera beneficium Deo contulit, ut haberet hodie per quem Deus cognosceretur et omnipotens vocaretur: nisi quod jam non omnipotens, si non et hoc potens, ex nihilo omnia proferre.' *Ibid.* [p. 236 B.] 'Quo igitur ab homine divina illa vis differret, si, ut homo, sic etiam Deus ope indiget aliena? indiget autem, si nihil moliri potest, nisi ab altero illi materia ministretur.' *Lactan. lib.* ii. *cap.* 9. [c. 8. vol. i. p. 121.]

80 As Hierocles, Καὶ τὶ καταλέγω σοι τούτους; ὅπου γε καὶ τῶν Πλατωνικῶν τινὲς οὐκ ὀρθὴν τὴν περὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεοῦ διασώζουσιν ἔννοιαν; οὐ γὰρ ἱκανὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι φήθησαν, αὐτοτελῶς ὑποστῆσαι δυνάσθαι κόσμον οἰκείᾳ δυνάμει καὶ σοφίᾳ ἐξ ἀϊδίου ἐνεργοῦντα· ἀλλ' ἀγεννήτου ὕλης συνεργείᾳ· καὶ τῇ μὴ παρ' αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσῃ φύσει καταχρώμενον, μόνως δημιουργεῖν δύνασθαι. *De Provid. et Fato.* [p. 246.]

81 Πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι ἢ ἐξ ὄντων ἢ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων· τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐκ μὴ ὄντων γίνεσθαι ἀδύνατον· περὶ γὰρ ταύτης ὁμογνωμονοῦσι τῆς δόξης ἅπαντες οἱ περὶ φύσεως. *Phys. lib.* iv. *cap.* 1*. [lib. i. c. iv. §. 4.]

*[It is well observed by Barrow, that "it is nowise harder, nor more impos- "sible, to produce matter itself, than to produce a form therein, without or "against its aptitude to receive it: nay, it seems more difficult to make children "to Abraham out of stones, than to make them out of nothing: *there* being a "positive obstacle to be removed; *here* no resistance appearing; there being as "well somewhat preceding to be destroyed, as something new to be produced." Vol. vi. p. 198.]

be the opinion of all natural Philosophers, I must first observe, that this universal proposition was first framed out of particular considerations of the works of art and nature. For if we look upon all kinds of artificers[82], we find they cannot give any specimen of their art without materials. Being then the beauty and uniformity of the world shews it to be a piece of art most exquisite, hence they concluded that the Maker of it was the most exact Artificer[83], and consequently had his matter from all eternity prepared for him. Again, considering the works of nature and all parts of the world subject to generation and corruption, they also observed[84] that nothing is ever generated but out of something preexistent, nor is there any mutation wrought but in a subject, and with a presupposed capability of alteration. From hence they presently collected, that if the whole world were ever generated, it must have been produced out of some subject, and consequently there must be a matter eternally preexisting.

Now what can be more irrational, than from the weakness of some creature to infer the same imbecility in the Creator, and to measure the arm of God by the finger of man? Whatsoever speaketh any kind of excellency or perfection in the artificer, may be attributed unto God: whatsoever signifieth any infirmity, or involveth any imperfection, must be excluded from the notion of him. That wisdom, prescience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an artist, is most eminently contained in him, who hath *ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight:* but if the most absolute idea in the artificer's understanding be not sufficient to produce his design without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto preexisting matter, than that he is really compounded of corporeal parts. Wisd. xi. 20.

Again, it is as incongruous to judge of the production of

82 'Ut igitur faber cum quid ædificaturus est, non ipse facit materiam, sed ea utitur quæ sit parata, fictorque item cera: sic isti providentiæ divinæ materiam præsto esse oportuit, non quam ipse faceret, sed quam haberet paratam.' *Cicero de Nat. Deorum.* [Fragm. ap. Lact. ii. 8.] Ἀπεικαστέον τῷ μὲν θεῷ τὸν τεχνίτην, τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα τῷ κόσμῳ. *Method.* περὶ τῶν γεννητῶν. [in Photii Bibl. 235. p. 303.]

83 So Hierocles calls him κοσμοποιὸν καὶ ἀριστότεχνον θεόν. *in Aur. Carm.* [v. i. p. 14.]

84 Ὅτι δὲ αἱ οὐσίαι, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἁπλῶς ὄντα ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινὸς γίνεται, ἐπισκοποῦντι γένοιτ' ἂν φανερόν· ἀεὶ γὰρ ἐστί τι ὃ ὑπόκειται, ἐξ οὗ γίνεται τὸ γιγνόμενον, οἷον τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ζῶα ἐκ σπέρματος. *Aristot. Phys. lib.* i. *cap.* 7. §. 6.

the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption: and thence to conclude, that if it ever had a cause of the being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are; and if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all. For nothing is more certain than that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see the plants grow from a seed; that is their ordinary way of generation: but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the preexisting plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the original of their being: but 55
this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egg are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed because the seed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within itself a power of germination; because the spawn and egg are sejungible from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolific power of generation; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminal bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all those creatures should arise. But in viviparous animals, whose offspring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminal or prolific power, this is not only improbable but inconceivable. And therefore being the Philosophers[85] themselves confess, that whereas now all animals are generated by the means of seed, and that the animals themselves must be at first before the seed

85 These words of Aristotle are very observable, in which he disputes against Speusippus and the Pythagoreans, who thought the rudiments of things first made, out of which they grew unto perfection: *Ὅσοι δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπεύσιππος, τὸ ἄριστον καὶ κάλλιστον μὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ καὶ τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰτία μὲν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ καλὸν καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐν τοῖς ἐκ τούτων, οὐκ ὀρθῶς οἴονται· τὸ γὰρ σπέρμα ἐξ ἑτέρων ἐστὶ προτέρων τελείων· καὶ τὸ πρῶτον οὐ σπέρμα ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέλειον. οἷον πρότερον ἄνθρωπον ἂν φαίη τις εἶναι τοῦ σπέρματος, οὐ τὸν ἐκ τούτου γεννώμενον, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἐξ οὗ τὸ σπέρμα. Metaph. lib.* xi. *cap.* 7. [§. 10.] By which words Aristotle hath sufficiently destroyed his own argument, which we produced before out of the first of the Physics, and is excellently urged in that philosophical piece attributed unto Justin Martyr: *Εἰ πρῶτόν ἐστι τὸ σπεῖρον σπέρμα, καὶ ὕστερον τὸ ἐκ σπέρματος γιγνόμενον, καὶ γενητὰ ἀμφότερα, τῇ μὲν γενέσει τοῦ κειμένου ἐκ σπέρματος γιγνομένου ὑπόκειται τὸ σπέρμα· τῇ δὲ γενέσει τοῦ σπείραντος ὑποκεῖσθαι τὸ σπέρμα οὐ δυνατόν. οὐκ ἄρα ἀεὶ τὰ ζῶα καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος γίνεται. Aristot. Dogm. Evers.* [i. p. 550 C.] *Ὅθεν οὐθεὶς λέγει τοῦ σπέρματος εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲ τοῦ ᾠοῦ εἶναι τὴν ἀλεκτορίδα· τῆς δὲ ἀλεκτορίδος τὸ ᾠὸν εἶναι, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λέγομεν. Plutarch. Sympos. lib.* ii. *Probl.* 3. [vol. ii. p. 636 F.]

proceeding from them; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to and differing from the common way of generation; and, consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Being then that universal maxim, that *nothing can be made of nothing*, is merely calculated for the meridian of natural causes, raised solely out of observation of continuing creatures by successive generation, which could not have been so continued without a being antecedent to all such succession; it is most evident it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being, which we call Creation.

Now when we thus describe the nature of creation, and under the name of *heaven and earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we must distinguish between things created. For some were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, some only mediately, as out of something formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of creation. By the first were made all immaterial substances, all the orders of angels, and the souls of men, the heavens, and the simple or elemental bodies, as the earth, the water, and the air. *In the beginning* Gen. i. 1.
God created the heaven and the earth; so *in the beginning*, as without any preexisting or antecedent matter: this earth, when so *in the beginning* made, was *without form and void*, covered Gen. i. 2.
with waters likewise made, not out of it but with it, the same which, *when the waters were gathered together unto one place, ap-* Verse 9.
peared as dry land. By the second[86], all *the hosts of the earth*, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea; *Let the earth*, Verse 11.
said God, *bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind. Let the waters bring forth abun-* Verse 20.
dantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth; and more expressly yet, *Out of the ground God* Gen. ii. 19.
formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air. And well may we grant these plants and animals to have their origination from such principles, when we read, *God formed man* Verse 7.
of the dust of the ground; and said unto him whom he created in his own image, *Dust thou art.* Gen. iii. 19.

Having thus declared the notion of creation in respect of those things which were created, the next consideration is of

86 'Hic visibilis mundus ex materia quæ a Deo facta fuerat, ['ex his quæ creata fuerant' is the Benedictine editor's reading,] factus est et ornatus.' *Gennad.* [Eccl. Dogm.] *cap.* 10. [p. 77 C.]

that action in reference to the Agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon first as moved; secondly, as free under that motion; thirdly, as determining under that freedom, and so performing of that action. In the first we may see his goodness, in the second his will, in the third his power. 56

I do not here introduce any external impulsive cause, as moving God unto the creation of the world; for I have presupposed all things distinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and consequently to be posterior not only to the motion but the actuation of his will. Being then nothing can be antecedent to the creature beside God himself, neither can any thing be a cause of any of his actions but what is in him; we must not look for any thing extrinsecal unto him, but wholly acquiesce in his infinite goodness, as the only moving and impelling cause. *There is none good but one, that is God*[87], saith our Saviour; none originally, essentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatsoever goodness is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whose very being is diffusive, whose nature consists in the communication of itself. In the end of the sixth day *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good:* which shews the end of creating all things thus good was the communication of that by which they were, and appeared, so.

Matt. xix. 17.

Gen. i. 31.

The ancient Heathens have acknowledged this truth[88], but with such disadvantage, that from thence they gathered an undoubted error. For from the goodness of God, which they did not unfitly conceive necessary, infinite, and eternal, they collected that whatsoever dependeth of it must be as necessary and eternal[89], even as light must be as ancient as the sun, and

87 Ἄλλο γὰρ τὸ ἐπίκτητον ἀγαθὸν, ἄλλο τὸ καθ' ἕξιν ἀγαθὸν, ἄλλο τὸ πρώτως ἀγαθόν. *Proclus in Timæum.* [lib. ii. p. 110 D.] Τὸ δὲ αὐτοαγαθὸν πρώτως ἀγαθόν. *Ibid.*

88 As Plato, Λέγωμεν δὴ δι' ἣν τινα αἰτίαν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τόδε ὁ ξυνιστὰς ξυνέστησεν· ἀγαθὸς ἦν. ἀγαθῷ δ' οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος· τούτου δ' ἐκτὸς ὢν πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα γενέσθαι ἐβουλήθη παραπλήσια ἑαυτῷ· ταύτην δὲ γενέσεως καὶ κόσμου μάλιστ' ἂν τὶς ἀρχὴν κυριωτάτην παρ' ἀνδρῶν φρονίμων ἀποδεχόμενος, ὀρθότατα ἀποδέχοιτ' ἄν. *In Timæo.* [p. 29 D.] Αἰτία γὰρ τῆς τῶν πάντων ποιήσεως οὐδεμία ἄλλη πρόσεστιν εὔλογος, πλὴν τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν ἀγαθότητος. *Hieroc. in Aur. Carm.* [v. i. p. 20.] Αἱ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀγαθότητα λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι τῆς δημιουργίας τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς, ἀνθρωπίναις μᾶλλον περιστάσεσιν ἢ τῷ θεῷ πρέπουσιν. *Ib.*

89 Ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθότητα ὄντος τοῦ κόσμου, ἀεί τε τὸν θεὸν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὑπάρχειν· ὥσπερ ἡλίῳ μὲν καὶ πυρὶ συνυφίσταται φῶς, σώματι δὲ σκιά. *Sallust. de Diis et Mundo, cap.* 7. [p. 24.] Εἰ γὰρ ἄμεινον μὴ ποιεῖν, πῶς εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν μεταβέβηκεν; εἰ δὲ τὸ ποιεῖν, τί μὴ ἐξ ἀϊδίου ἔπραττεν; *Hierocl. de Fato et Provid.* [p. 248]. Neither doth he mean any less, when in his

a shadow as an opacous body in that light. If then there be no instant imaginable before which God was not infinitely good, then can there likewise be none conceivable before which the world was not made. And thus they thought the goodness of the Creator must stand or fall with the eternity of the creature.

For the clearing of which ancient mistake, we must observe, that as God is essentially and infinitely good without any mixture of deficiency, so is he in respect of all external actions or emanations absolutely free without the least necessity. Those bodies which do act without understanding or preconception of what they do, as the sun and fire give light and heat, work always to the utmost of their power, nor are they able at any time to sus-
57 pend their action. To conceive any such necessity in the divine

sense he thus describes the first cause of all things: Ἐστ' ἂν (so I read it, not ἐστ', ἄν, as the printed copies, or ἕως ἄν, as Curterius) ᾗ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῶν αἴτιον ἀμετάβλητον πάντη καὶ ἄτρεπτον, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τὴν αὐτὴν κεκτημένον, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα οὐκ ἐπίκτητον ἔχον, ἀλλ' οὐσιωμένην καθ' αὑτὴν, καὶ δι' αὑτὴν [αὐτῆς in Needham's edition] τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὸ εἶναι παράγον· (so I read it, not πάντων πρὸς τὸ εὖ εἶναι, as the printed.) *Hierocl. in Aur. Carm.* [v. i. p. 20.] Συνήρτηται ἄρα τῇ μὲν ἀγαθότητι τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ τῆς προνοίας ἐκτένεια· ταύτῃ δὲ ἡ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ διαιώνιος ποίησις· ταύτῃ δὲ ἡ τοῦ παντὸς κατὰ τὸν ἄπειρον ἀϊδιότης.—καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ταύτην τε ἀναιρεῖ, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ πεποιηκότος. *Proclus in Timæum.* [lib. ii. p. 111 E.] Now although this be the constant argumentation of the later Platonists, yet they found no such deduction or consequence in their master Plato; and I something incline to think, though it may seem very strange, that they received it from the Christians, I mean out of the School of Ammonius at Alexandria; whom though Porphyrius would make an apostate, for the credit of his heathen gods, yet St. Jerome hath sufficiently assured us that he lived and died in the Christian faith.* The reason of my conjecture is no more than this: Proclus acknowledgeth that Plutarch and others, though with Plato they maintained the goodness of God to be the cause of the world, yet withal denied the eternity of it: and when he quotes other expositors for his own opinion, he produceth none but Porphyrius and Iamblichus, the eldest of which was the scholar of Plotinus the disciple of Ammonius. And that he was of that opinion, I collect from him who was his scholar both in philosophy and divinity, that is, Origen, whose judgment, if it were not elsewhere apparent, is sufficiently known by the Fragment of Methodius, Περὶ γεννητῶν, preserved in Photius [Bibl. 235. p. 302]. Ὅτι ὁ Ὠριγένης, ὃν κέντανρον καλεῖ, ἔλεγε συναΐδιον εἶναι τῷ μόνῳ σοφῷ καὶ ἀπροσδεεῖ θεῷ τὸ πᾶν. Being then Porphyrius and Iamblichus cited by Proclus, being Hierocles, Proclus, and Sallustius were all either ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς γενεᾶς, as they called it, that is, descended successively from the School of Ammonius, (the great conciliator of Plato and Aristotle, and reformer of the ancient Philosophy,) or at least contemporary to them that were so; it is most probable that they might receive it from his mouth, especially considering that even Origen a Christian confirmed the same.

* [Eusebius says the same, (Hist. Eccles. vi. 19.) but the testimony of Porphyry is preferred by Brucker, Mosheim, &c. There were two persons named Ammonius; one of whom was a Christian writer; the other was founder of the later Platonists.]

operations, were to deny all knowledge in God, to reduce him into a condition inferior to some of the works of his own hands, and to fall under the censure contained in the Psalmist's question, *He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?* Those creatures which are endued with understanding, and consequently with a will, may not only be necessitated in their actions by a greater power, but also as necessarily be determined by the proposal of an infinite good: whereas neither of these necessities can be acknowledged in God's actions, without supposing a power beside and above Omnipotency, or a real happiness beside and above All-sufficiency. Indeed if God were a necessary Agent in the works of creation, the creatures would be of as necessary being as he is: whereas the necessity of being is the undoubted prerogative of the first Cause. *He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,* saith the Apostle: and wheresoever counsel is, there is election, or else it is vain; where a will, there must be freedom, or else it is weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce any thing but what he determineth to produce; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If then his determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the actions which follow them be also free. Being then the goodness of God is absolutely perfect of itself, being he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happiness as little capable of augmentation as of diminution; he cannot be thought to look upon any thing without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If then we consider God's Goodness, he was moved; if his All-sufficiency, he was not necessitated: if we look upon his Will, he freely determined; if on his Power, by that determination he created the world.

Psal. xciv. 9, 10.

Eph. i. 11.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God's goodness in the eternal creation of the world will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocal notion of goodness. For if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all virtue and holiness, with a negation of all things morally evil, vicious, or unholy; so God is absolutely and necessarily good: but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did which made this argument, that is, rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others; then God is not

necessarily, but freely, good, that is to say, profitable and beneficial. For he had not been in the least degree evil or unjust, if he had never made the world or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing any thing beside himself. Every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow whatever he gives; much more must that one eternal and independent Being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation. We must then look no farther than the determination of God's will in the creation of the world.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to perform. So the Elders speak before him that sitteth upon the throne: *Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure* (that is, by thy will) *they are, and were created.* Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumental advantage in the agent, there the actual determination of the will is a sufficient production. Thus God did make the heavens and the earth by willing [90] them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. *Let there be light* [91], this is the injunction; *and there was light,* that is the creation. Which two are so intimately and immediately the same, that though in our and other translations [92] those words, *let there be,* which express the command of God, differ from the other, *there was,* which denote the present existence of the creature; yet in the original there is no difference at all, neither in point nor letter. And yet even in the diversity of the translation the phrase seems so expressive of God's infinite power, and immediate efficacy of his will, that it hath raised some admiration of Moses in the enemies [93] of the religion both

Rev. iv. 11.

Gen. i. 4.

58

90 So Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of God, Ψιλῷ τῷ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ, καὶ τῷ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἔπεται τὸ γεγενῆσθαι. *Protrept.* [c. iv. vol. i. p. 55.]

91 Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα ἔργον ἦν. *S. Basil.* [In Hexaem. Hom. II. 7. vol. i. p. 19 C.] Ὅταν δὲ φωνὴν ἐπὶ θεοῦ καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ πρόσταγμα λέγωμεν,—τὴν ἐν τῷ θελήματι ῥοπὴν—ἡγούμεθα ἐν εἴδει προστάγματος σχηματίζεσθαι. *Idem, in Hexaem.* [ib.] Τίνος ὑπουργίας δέοιτο ὁ θελήματι μόνῳ δημιουργῶν, ὁμοῦ τῇ βουλήσει συνυφισταμένης τῆς κτίσεως; *Idem, lib.* ii. *adv. Eunom.* [§. 21. vol. i. p. 257 B.]

92 As, Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. *Fiat lux, et facta est lux;* or as Aquila, Γενέσθω, καὶ ἐγένετο· as Symmachus, Ἔστω, καὶ ἐγένετο· all with a difference: whereas in the Hebrew it is a most expressive and significant tautology יהי אור ויהי אור.

93 As Dionysius Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους, *sect.* 9. [p. 22.] Ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνὴρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐγνώρισε κἀξέφηνεν, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας

of the Jews and Christians. *God is in the heavens, he hath done whatsoever he pleased*[94], saith David; yea in the making of the heavens, he therefore created them, because *he pleased;* nay more, he thereby created them, even by willing their creation.

Now although some may conceive the creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of God's will, and it is so far certainly true, that there is no instant assignable before which God could not have made the world; yet as this is an Article of our Faith, we are bound to believe
Heb. xi. 3. the heavens and earth are not eternal. *Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God.* And by that faith we are assured, that whatsoever possibility of an eternal existence of the creature may be imagined, actually it had a temporal beginning; and therefore all the arguments for this world's eternity are nothing but so many erroneous misconcep-
Prov. viii. 22, 23. tions. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old,* saith Wisdom. *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.* And the same Wisdom of God being made man reflecteth upon the same priority,
Joh. xvii. 5. saying, *Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Yea, in the
Eph. i. 3, 4. same Christ are we *blessed with all spiritual blessings, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.* The impossibility of the origination of a circular motion, which we are sure is either in the heaven or earth, and the impropriety of the beginning of time, are so poor exceptions, that they deserve not the least labour of refutation. The actual eternity of this world is so far from being necessary, that it is of itself most improbable; and without the infallible certainty of faith, there is no single person carries more evidences of his youth, than the world of its novelty[95].

It is true indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would persuade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the world, far beyond the annals of Moses, and account of the same Spirit

τῶν νόμων, Εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, φησί· τί; γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο. Where observe, Longinus made use of the translation of Aquila.

94 Πάντα ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ· ὁρᾷς ὅτι οὐχὶ πρὸς τὴν δημιουργίαν τῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὴν κτίσιν τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἤρκεσεν ἡ θέλησις αὐτοῦ μόνη; *S. Chrysost.* Περὶ τοῦ ἀκαταλήπτου ii. [§. 4. vol. i. p. 457 E.]

95 As even Lucretius confesseth, and that out of the principles of Epicurus:

Verum, ut opinor, habet novitatem summa, recensque
Natura est mundi, neque pridem exordia cepit.

De Rer. Nat. lib. v. ver. 33.

which made it*. The Egyptian Priests pretended an exact chronology for some myriads of years[96], and the Chaldeans or Assyrians far out-reckon them[97], in which they delivered not only a catalogue of their kings, but also a table of the eclipses of the sun and moon[98].

59 But for their number of years nothing is more certain than their forgery; for the Egyptians did preserve the antiquities of other nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When Alexander entered Egypt with his victorious army, the Priests could shew him out of their sacred histories an account of the Persian empire, which he gained by conquest, and the Macedonian, which he received by birth, of each for eight thousand years[99]: whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best historical account, than that the Persian empire, whether begun in Cyrus or in Medus, was not then three hundred years old, and the Macedonian, begun in Coranus, not five hundred. They then

96 Plato tells us of an account which an Egyptian priest gave to Solon, in which the Athenians were 9000 years old, and those of Sais 8000. *Προτέραν μὲν τὴν παρ' ὑμῖν ἔτεσι χιλίοις ἐκ γῆς τε καὶ Ἡφαίστου τὸ σπέρμα παραλαβοῦσα ὑμῶν, τήνδε δὲ ὑστέραν· τῆς δὲ ἐνθάδε διακοσμήσεως παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ὀκτακισχιλίων ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸς γέγραπται.* *In Timæo.* [p. 23 D.] Pomponius Mela makes a larger account out of Herodotus: 'Ipsi vetustissimi (ut prædicant) hominum trecentos et triginta reges ante Amasim, et supra tredecim millium annorum ætates certis annalibus;' [lib. i. cap. ix. §. 8.] where, as the Egyptians much stretch the truth, so doth Mela stretch the relation of Herodotus, who makes it not 13,000, but 11,340 years. [ii. 142.] Diodorus Siculus [i. 26.] tells us of 23,000 years from the reign of the first king of Egypt to the expedition of Alexander; and Diogenes Laertius, out of other authors, more than doubles that account. *Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν γὰρ Νείλου γενέσθαι παῖδα Ἥφαιστον, ὃν ἄρξαι φιλοσοφίας, ἧς τοὺς προεστῶτας ἱερέας εἶναι καὶ προφήτας· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακέδονα ἐτῶν εἶναι μυριάδας τέσσαρας, καὶ ὀκτακισχιλία ὀκτακόσια ἔτη ἑξήκοντα τρία·* [Procem. §. 1, 2.]

97 *Ἀσσύριοι δέ, φησιν Ἰάμβλιχος, οὐχ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι μυριάδας ἐτῶν μόνας ἐτήρησαν, ὥς φησιν Ἵππαρχος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλας ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ περιόδους τῶν ἑπτὰ κοσμοκρατόρων μνήμῃ παρέδοσαν.* *Proclus in Timæum.* [lib. i. p. 31 C.]

98 *Ἐν οἷς ἡλίου μὲν ἐκλείψεις γενέσθαι τριακοσίας ἑβδομήκοντα τρεῖς, σελήνης δὲ ὀκτακοσίους τριάκοντα δύο.* *Diog. Laert.* [Procem. §. 2.]

99 This fallacy appeareth by an epistle which Alexander wrote to his mother Olympias, mentioned by Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustin. 'Persarum autem et Macedonum imperium usque ad ipsum Alexandrum, cui loquebatur, plus quam octo millium annorum ['octo et annorum millium' in the Bened. ed.] ille constituit; cum apud Græcos Macedonum usque ad mortem Alexandri quadringenti octoginta quinque reperiantur; Persarum vero, donec ipsius Alexandri victoria finiretur, ducenti et triginta tres computentur.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xii. *cap.* 10. [vol. vii. p. 309 C.]

* [i. e. far beyond also the account given by persons who were inspired by the same Spirit which made the world.]

which made so large additions to advance the antiquity of other nations, and were so bold as to present them to those which so easily might refute them, (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honourable cheat,) may without any breach of charity be suspected to have extended the account much higher for the honour of their own country. Beside, their catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the Egyptians make their first kings' reigns above one thousand two hundred years apiece[1], and the Assyrians theirs above forty thousand*; except ye take the Egyptian years for months[2], the Assyrians for days; and then the account will not seem so formidable.

Again, for the calculation of eclipses, as it may be made for

[1] As Diodorus Siculus takes notice of the Egyptians, and Abydenus of the Chaldeans, whose ten first kings reigned 120 sari. Ὡς τοὺς πάντας εἶναι βασιλεῖς δέκα· ὧν ὁ χρόνος τῆς βασιλείας συνῆξε σάρους ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι. [Euseb. Chron. lib. i. p. 5.] Now this word *σάρος* was proper to the Babylonian or Chaldean account. *Hesych.* Σάρος, ἀριθμός τις παρὰ Βαβυλωνίοις· but what this number was, he tells us not. In the fragment of Abydenus preserved by Eusebius. [Chron. lib. i. p. 5.] Σάρος δέ ἐστιν ἐξακόσια καὶ τρισχίλια ἔτη· every *σάρος* is 3600 years, and consequently the 120 *σάροι* belonging to the reign of the ten kings 432,000 years. Neither was this the account only of Abydenus, but also of Berosus; neither was the interpretation only of Eusebius, but also of Alexander Pŏlyhistor. [in Euseb. Chron. lib. i. p. 6.] who likewise expresseth τὸν χρόνον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν σάρους ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι, ἤτοι ἐτῶν μυριάδας τεσσαράκοντα τρεῖς καὶ δύο χιλιάδας. This seemed so highly incredible, that two ancient monks, Anianus and Panodorus, interpreted those Chaldean years to be but days so that every *σάρος* should consist of 3600 days, that is, nine years, ten months and a half; and the whole 120 *σάροι* for the ten kings 1183 years, six months, and odd days. This is all which Jos. Scaliger or Jacobus Goar of late could find concerning this Chaldean computation: and the first of these complains that none but Hesychius makes mention of this account. I shall therefore supply them, not only with another author, but also with a diverse and distinct interpretation. Σάροι μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις· οἱ γὰρ ρκ′ σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ′, οἳ γίνονται ιη′ ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ. That is, according to the translation of Portus, *Sari apud Chaldæos est mensura et numerus: nam* 120 *sari faciunt annos* 2222, *qui sunt anni* 18 *et sex menses.* Well might he fix his N. L. or *non liquet*, to these words; for as they are in the printed books, there is no sense to be made of them; but by the help of the MS. in the Vatican Library, we shall both supply the defect in Suidas, and find a third valuation of the *σάροι*. Thus then that MS. represents the words: Οἱ γὰρ ρκ′ σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ′ κατὰ τὴν Χαλδαίων ψῆφον, εἴπερ ὁ σάρος ποιεῖ μῆνας σεληνιακῶν σκβ′, οἳοι γίνονται ιη′ ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ. And so the sense is clear. Σάρος, according to the Chaldee account, comprehends 222 months, which come to eighteen years and six months; therefore 120 *σάροι* make 2220 years; and therefore for *βσκβ′*, I read, leaving out the last *β*, *βσκ′*, that is, 2220.

[2] Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅ φησιν Εὔδοξος ἀληθὲς, ὅτι Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν μῆνα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκάλουν, οὐκ ἂν ἡ τῶν πολλῶν τούτων ἐνιαυτῶν ἀπαρίθμησις ἔχοι τὶ θαυμαστόν. *Proclus in Timæum*, xxxi. 50. [p. 31 F.]

* [In the first edition it is thirty thousand.]

many thousand years to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to-morrow; because the calculation must be made with this tacit condition, if the bodies of the earth, and sun, and moon, do continue in their substance and constant motion so long: so may it also be made for many millions of years past, and all be true, if the world have been so old; which the calculating doth not prove, but suppose. He then which should in the Egyptian temples see the description of so many eclipses of the sun and moon, could not be assured that they were all taken from real observation, when they might be as well described out of proleptical supposition.

Beside, the motions of the sun, which they mention together and with authority equal to that of their other observations, are so incredible and palpably fabulous, that they take off all credit and esteem from the rest of their narrations. For with this wild account of years, and seemingly accurate observations of the heavens, they left it written to posterity, that the whole course of
60 the celestial motions were four times changed: so that the sun hath twice risen in the east, and set in the west, as now it does; and, on the contrary, twice risen in the west, and set in the east[3]. And thus these prodigious antiquaries confute themselves[4].

3 Ἐν τοίνυν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τετράκις ἔλεγον ἐξ ἠθέων τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατεῖλαι· ἔνθα τε νῦν καταδύεται, ἐντεῦθεν δὶς ἐπαντεῖλαι· καὶ ἔνθεν νῦν ἀνατέλλει, ἐνθαῦτα δὶς καταδῦναι. *Herod. Euterp.* [c. 142.] 'Mandatumque literis servant, dum Ægyptii sunt, quater cursus suos vertisse sidera, ac solem bis jam occidisse unde nunc oritur.' *Mela, lib.* i. *cap.* 10. [c. ix. §. 8.] Whereas Aristotle more soberly, Ἐν ἅπαντι γὰρ τῷ παρεληλυθότι χρόνῳ κατὰ τὴν παραδεδομένην ἀλλήλοις μνήμην οὐθὲν φαίνεται μεταβεβληκὸς, οὔτε καθ' ὅλον τὸν ἔσχατον οὐρανὸν, οὔτε κατὰ μόριον αὐτοῦ τῶν οἰκείων οὐθέν. *De Cœlo, lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [§. 11.] *Vide Simplic.* [ad loc.]

4 As the Chaldees did affirm that they had taken observations of the celestial motions for 470,000 years; and withal they also affirmed, that for the same space of time they had calculated the nativity of all the children which were born. Which last is certainly false. 'Nam quod aiunt quadringenta et septuaginta millia annorum in periclitandis experiundisque pueris quicunque essent nati Babylonios posuisse, fallunt: si enim esset factitatum, non esset desitum. Neminem autem habemus auctorem qui aut fieri dicat, aut factum sciat.' *Cicero. lib.* ii. *de Divinat.* [c. xlvi. §. 97.] And if the last be false, we have no reason to believe the first is true; but rather to deny their astronomical observations by their vain ambition in astrological predictions. And indeed those observations of the Chaldees being curiously searched into by Callisthenes, appointed by Aristotle for that purpose, were found really to go no farther than 1903 years before Alexander, as Porphyrius hath declared, who was no friend to the account of Moses. Διὰ τὸ μήπω τὰς ὑπὸ Καλλισθένους ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος πεμφθείσας παρατηρήσεις ἀφίκεσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦτο ἐπισκήψαντος αὐτῷ· ἃς τινας διηγεῖται ὁ Πορφύριος χιλίων ἐτῶν εἶναι καὶ ἐννεακοσίων τριῶν μέχρι τῶν χρόνων Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος σωζόμενας. *Simplic. ad lib.* ii. *Aristot. de Cœlo, p.* 123.

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous descriptions for the world's antiquity, in respect not only of the infallible annals of the Spirit of God, but even of the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the real appearances and face of things, which speak them of a far shorter date?

If we look into the historians which give account of ancient times, nay, if we peruse the fictions of the poets, we shall find the first to have no footsteps, the last to feign no actions, of so great antiquity. If the race of men had been eternal [5], or as old as the Egyptians and the Chaldees fancy it, how should it come to pass that the poetical inventions should find no actions worthy their heroic verse before the Trojan or the Theban war, or that great adventure of the Argonauts? For whatsoever all the Muses, the daughters of Memory, could rehearse before those times, is nothing but the creation of the world, and the nativity of their gods.

If we consider the necessaries of life, the ways of freedom and commerce amongst men, and the inventions [6] of all arts and sciences, the letters which we use, and languages which we speak, they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first authors. The first beginnings were then so known and acknowledged by all, that the inventors and authors of them were reckoned amongst their gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficial: which honour and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

If we search into the nations themselves, we shall see none

5 This argument is therefore to me the stronger, because made by him who cannot be thought a favourer of our religion, because he was a countenancer of none, Epicurus, whose mind is thus delivered by Lucretius;

Præterea, si nulla fuit genitalis origo
Terrarum et cœli, semperque æterna fuere,
Cur supera bellum Thebanum et funera Trojæ,
Non alias alii quoque res cecinere Poetæ?
Quo tot facta virum toties cecidere? neque usquam
Æternis famæ monumentis insita florent?
De Rer. Nat. lib. v. ver. 325.

6 Pliny gives a large account of these, *lib.* vii. *cap.* 57. and Lucretius makes use of this argument;

Quare etiam quædam nunc artes expoliuntur,
Nunc etiam augescunt, nunc addita navigiis sunt
Multa; modo organici melicos peperere sonores:
Denique natura hæc rerum ratioque reperta est
Nuper, et hanc primus cum primis ipse repertus
Nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces.
De Rer. Nat. lib. v. ver. 333.

without some original: and were those authors extant which have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of cities and countries[7], their first rudiments would appear as evident as their later growth and present condition. We know what ways within two thousand years people have made through vast and thick woods for their
61 habitations, now as fertile, as populous as any. The Hercynian trees, in the time of the Cæsars, occupying so great a space, as to take up a journey of sixty days[8], were thought even then coeval with the world[9]. We read without any show of contradiction, how this western part of the world hath been peopled from the east; and all the pretence of the Babylonian antiquity is nothing else, but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the ark, descending from the Gordiæan mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in the plain of Sinaar, made their first division at that place; and that dispersion, or rather dissemination, hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the flood.

These arguments have always seemed so clear and undeniable, that they have put not only those who make the world eternal, but them also who confess it made, (but far more ancient than we believe it,) to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrational.

For to this they replied, that this world hath suffered many alterations[10], by the utter destructions of nations and depopulations

7 I mean, not only such as wrote the building of particular cities, as Apollonius Rhodius Καύνου κτίσιν, Xenophanes Κολοφῶνος κτίσιν, Crito Συρακουσῶν κτίσιν, and Philochorus Σαλαμῖνος κτίσιν· but those more general, as Aristotle Κτίσεις καὶ πολιτείας, Polemo Κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν Φωκίδι, Charon Πόλεων κτίσεις, Callimachus Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων, Hellanicus Κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, and the indefinite Κτίσεις written by Dercyllus, Dionysius, Hippys, Clitophon, Trisimachus, and others.

8 'Sylvarum, Hercynia—dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut major aliis, ita et notior.' *Mela, lib.* iii. *cap.* 3. §. 3.

9 'Hercyniæ sylvæ roborum vastitas intacta ævis et congenita mundo, prope immortali sorte miracula excedit.' *Plin. lib.* xvi. *cap.* 2.

10 Thus Ocellus, who maintained the world was never made, answers the argument brought from the Greek Histories which began with Inachus, as the first subject, not author of History, (as Nogarola in his Annotations mistakes Ocellus,) Διὸ καὶ τοῖς λέγουσι τὴν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Ἰνάχου εἶναι τοῦ Ἀργείου, προσεκτέον οὕτως, οὐχ ὡς ἀπό τινος ἀρχῆς πρώτης, ἀλλὰ τῆς γενομένης μεταβολῆς κατ' αὐτήν. So that he will have Inachus to be the first not absolutely, but since the last great alteration made in Greece; and then he concludes that Greece hath often been, and will often be, barbarous, and lose the memory of all their actions: Πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔσται βάρβαρος ἡ Ἑλλὰς, οὐχ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων μόνον γινομένη μετάστατος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως οὐ μείζονος οὐδὲ μείονος αὐτῆς γινομένης, ἀλλὰ γὰρ νεωτέρας ἀεὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀρχὴν

of countries, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and sciences utterly lost, all fair and stately fabrics ruined, and so mankind reduced to paucity, and the world often again returned into its infancy. This they conceived to have been done oftentimes in several ages, sometimes by a deluge of water, sometimes by a torrent of fire; and lest any of the elements might be thought not to conspire to the destruction of mankind, the air must sweep away whole empires at once with infectious plagues, and earthquakes swallow up all ancient cities, and bury even the very ruins of them. By which answer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Christian Faith. First, because they manifestly shew that they had an universal tradition of Noah's flood, and the overthrow of the old world: secondly, because it was evident to them, that there was no way to salve the eternity or antiquity of the world, or to answer this argument drawn from history and the appearances of things themselves, but by supposing innumerable deluges and deflagrations. Which being merely feigned in themselves, not proved, (and that first by them[11] which say they are not subject themselves unto them, as the Egyptians did, who by the advantage of their peculiar situation[12] feared neither perishing by fire

λαμβανούσης. *Ocell. de Universo, cap.* 3. [p. 44.] Thus Plato, who asserted the creation of the world, but either from eternity, or such antiquity as does not much differ from it, brings in Solon inquiring the age of the Greek Histories, as of Phoroneus, and Niobe, Deucalion and Pyrrha; and an Egyptian priest answering, that all the Greeks were boys, and not an old man amongst them; that is, they had no ancient monuments, or history of any antiquity, but rested contented with the knowledge of the time since the last great mutation of their own country. Πολλαὶ γὰρ κατὰ πολλὰ φθοραὶ γεγόνασιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔσονται, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ ὕδατι μέγισται, μυρίοις δὲ ἄλλοις ἕτεραι βραχύτεραι. *In Timæo.* [p. 22 C.] Origen of Celsus, Τὸ πολλὰς ἐκ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἐκπυρώσεις γεγονέναι, πολλὰς δ' ἐπικλύσεις, καὶ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμὸν ἔναγχος γεγενημένον· σαφῶς τοῖς ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ δυναμένοις παρίστησι τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν τοῦ κόσμου ἀγένητον. *lib.* i. [§. 19. vol. i. p. 337 C.] And Lucretius the Epicurean, who thought the world but few thousand years old, as we believe, and that it should at last be consumed, as we also are persuaded, thinks this answer of theirs so far from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the latter part of his opinion:

Quod si forte fuisse antehac eadem
omnia credis,
Sed periisse hominum torrenti sæcla
vapore,
Aut cecidisse urbeis magno vexamine
mundi,
Aut ex imbribus assiduis exisse rapaceis
Per terras amneis, atque oppida co-
operuisse:
Tanto quippe magis victus fateare ne-
cesse est,
Exitium quoque terrai cœlique futurum.
De Rer. Nat. lib. v. ver. 339.

11 Ἔστωσαν δὲ τῷ Κέλσῳ τοῦ περὶ τῶν ἐκπυρώσεων καὶ ἐξυδατώσεων μύθου διδάσκαλοι οἱ κατ' αὐτὸν σοφώτατοι Αἰγύπτιοι. *Orig. adv. Cels. lib.* i. [c. 20. p. 338 B.]

12 So that Egyptian priest in Plato's Timæus tells Solon, that the Fable of Phaethon did signify a real con-

nor water,) serve only for a confirmation of Noah's flood so many ages past, and the surer expectation of St. Peter's fire, we know not how soon to come.

62 It remaineth then that we steadfastly believe, not only that the *heavens and earth and all the host of them* were made, and so Gen. ii. 1. acknowledge a creation, or an actual and immediate dependence of all things on God; but also that all things were created by the hand of God, in the same manner, and at the same time, which are delivered unto us in the books of Moses by the Spirit of God, and so acknowledge a novity, or no long existence of the creature.

Neither will the novity of the world appear more plainly unto our conceptions, than if we look upon our own successions. The vulgar accounts, which exhibit about five thousand six hundred years, though sufficiently refuting an eternity, and allaying all conceits of any great antiquity, are not yet so properly and nearly operative on the thoughts of men, as a reflection upon our own generations. The first of men was but six days younger than the being, not so many than the appearance, of the earth: and if any particular person would consider how many degrees in a direct line he probably is removed from that single person Adam, who bare together the name of man and of the earth from whence he came, he could not choose but think himself so near the original fountain of mankind, as not to conceive any great antiquity of the world. For though the ancient Heathens did imagine innumerable ages and generations[13] of men past,

flagration of the world; but so as all they which lived in mountains or dry parts of the earth were scorched and consumed, but of those which lived near the seas or rivers, in the valleys, some were preserved. Ἡμῖν δὲ, saith he, ὁ Νεῖλος εἴς τε τἆλλα σωτὴρ, καὶ τότε ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἀπορίας σώζει λυόμενος. [Plat. Tim. 22 D.] Thus the Egyptians pretend Nilus saved them from the flames of Phaethon. Nor were they only safe from conflagrations, but from inundations also. For when in Greece or other parts a deluge happened, then all their cities were swept away into the sea: Κατὰ δὲ τήνδε τὴν χώραν, says the priest, οὔτε τότε, οὔτε ἄλλοτε ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρούρας ὕδωρ ἐπιρρεῖ· τὸ δ' ἐναντίον κάτωθεν ἐπανιέναι πέφυκεν· ὅθεν καὶ δι' ἃς αἰτίας τἀνθάδε σωζόμενα λέγεται παλαιότατα. [ibid.] So Egypt receiving not their waters from above by clouds, but from below by springs filling the river Nile, was out of danger in a deluge, and thereby preserved the most ancient monuments and records. But, alas, this is a poor shift to them which believe that in the great and universal flood, *all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.* Gen. vii. 11.

13 So Cicero indeed speaks, *innumerabilia sæcula*, in his book of Divination; [ii. c. lxxi. §. 147.] and Socrates in Plato's Theætetus brings this argument against the pride of great and noble families, that they which mention a succession of their ancestors which have been rich and powerful, do it merely ὑπὸ ἀπαιδευσίας, οὐ δυναμένων εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἀεὶ βλέπειν, οὐδὲ λογίζεσθαι, ὅτι πάππων καὶ προγόνων μυριάδες ἑκάστῳ γεγόνασιν ἀναρίθμητοι, ἐν αἷς πλούσιοι καὶ πτωχοὶ, καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ δοῦλοι, βάρβαροί τε καὶ

though Origen[14] did fondly seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the Scriptures; yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the chronology of the sacred Writ, we shall find no man's pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the world, we find ten generations extend to one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years, according to the shortest, which is thought, because the Hebrew, therefore the best account; according to the longest, which, because the Septuagint's, is not to be contemned, two thousand two hundred and sixty-two, or rather, two thousand two hundred and fifty-six. From the flood, brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, upon * the birth of Abraham, the father of the faithful, not above ten generations, if so many, took up two hundred and ninety-two years according to the least, one thousand one hundred and thirty-two according to the largest account. Since which time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long; and it is agreed by all that there have not passed since the birth of Abraham three thousand and seven hundred years. Now by the experience of our families, which for their honour and greatness have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred Scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed Evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgment of former ages, three generations[15] 63

"Ελληνες πολλάκις μυρίοι γεγόνασιν ὁτῳοῦν· [Theæt. 175 A.] as if every person were equally honourable, having innumerable ancestors, rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous.

14 Origen did not only collect the eternity of the world from the coexistence of all God's attributes, as because he is παντοκράτωρ and δημιουργός, therefore he was always so, (for how could he be δημιουργὸς ἄνευ δημιουργημάτων, or παντοκράτωρ ἄνευ τῶν κρατουμένων;) but also from the 90th Psalm; *From everlasting to everlasting thou art God. For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday:* and that at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus; *Who can number the sand of the sea, and the drops of the rain, and the days of eternity?* But Methodius, Bishop and Martyr, hath well concluded that disputation: Ταῦτά φησιν ὁ Ὠριγένης σπουδάζων, καὶ ὅρα οἷα παίζει. [Phot. Bibl. 235. p. 304.]

15 By the Greeks called Γενεαί, which are successions of generations from father to son: as in St. Matth. i. 17. Indeed sometimes they take it for other spaces of time; as Artemidorus observes, for seven years: Κατ' ἐνίους μὲν ἔτη ζ'. ὅθεν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἰατρικοὶ, τῶν δύο γενεῶν (not πρὸ τῶν, as Wolfius and Portus would correct it) μηδένα (not μὴ δεῖν, as Suidas) φλεβοτομεῖν, τὸν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκαετῆ (not τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατον, as Suidas transcribing him negligently) λέγοντες. Sometimes they interpret it twenty, twenty-five, or thirty years, as appears by Hesychius: and by that

* [*Upon.* This means *to* the birth of Abraham. The words "upon the birth " —— three thousand and seven hundred years" were not in the first edition.]

usually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet three thousand and seven hundred years since the birth of Abraham * as certainly it is not; if all men which are or have been since have descended from Noah, as undoubtedly they have; if Abraham were but the tenth from Noah, as Noah from Adam, which Moses hath assured us: then it is not probable that any person now alive is above one hundred and thirty generations removed from Adam. And indeed thus admitting but the Greek account of less than five thousand years since the flood, we may easily bring all sober or probable accounts of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Chineses, to begin since the dispersion at Babel. Thus having expressed at last the time, so far as it is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second consideration of the nature and notion of creation.

Now being under the terms of *heaven and earth* we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing; the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he which made all things is God. This truth is so evident in itself, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withal affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, than to assert God so the Creator of the world as he is described in this Article.

Being then we *believe in God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth*, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the Deity; our first assertion which we must make good is, that the one God did create the world. Again, being whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of creation, as being an

last account they reckoned the years of Nestor, Κατ' ἐνίους δὲ λ'. ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Νέστορα βούλονται εἰς ἐννενήκοντα ἔτη γεγονέναι· so Artemidorus and the grammarians. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of Homer;

Τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
Ἐφθίαθ', οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο. Ἰλ. α'. 250.

And I conceive that gloss in Hesychius, Ἐπὶ διαστήματος χρόνων τῶν μὴ κατ' αὐτὸ βεβιωκότων, to be far more properly applicable to that place. But, in the sense of which now we speak, it is taken for the third part ordinarily of an hundred years; as Herodotus, mentioning the Egyptian feigned genealogies, Καί τοι τριηκόσιαι μὲν ἀνδρῶν γενεαὶ δυνέαται μύρια ἔτεα, 300 *generations equalize* 10,000 *years*, γενεαὶ γὰρ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἔτεά ἐστι. *Euterp.* [c. 142.] And after him Clemens Alexandrinus, Εἰς τὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τρεῖς ἐγκαταλέγονται γενεαί. *Strom. lib.* i. [c. 21. vol. i. p. 401.]

* [In the first edition it was, "If then it be not yet four thousand years since "the universal deluge."]

emanation of the Divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter shew that we believe some other persons to be the same God; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the creation of the world is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of itself, it is so obvious to all which have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied, (as there is nothing so senseless, but some kind of heretics have embraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better than of the former,) I shall briefly declare the creation of the world to have been performed by that one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world as to infer a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their original any way derogatory
Gen. i. 31. to the Creator. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good,* and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit always to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil, is not so by the Creator's action, but by the creature's defection.

In vain then did the heretics of old, to remove a seeming in- 64
convenience, renounce a certain truth; and whilst they feared to make their own God evil[16], they made him partial, or but half the Deity, and so a companion at least with an evil God. For dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil and substantially good, and apprehending a necessity of an origination conformable to so different a condition, they imagined one God essentially good, as the first principle of the one, another God essentially evil, as the original of the other. And this strange heresy began upon the first spreading of the Gospel[17]; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow.

16 'Inde Manichæus, ut Deum a conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit auctorem.' *S. Hier. in Nahum, cap* 3. [vol. vi. p. 582 E.]

17 For we must not look upon Manes as the first author of the heresy, though they which followed him were called from him Manichæans. Nor must we be satisfied with the relation of Socrates, [H. E. i. c. 22. p. 54] who allots the beginning of that heresy *μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν Κωνσταντίνου χρόνων*, a little before Constantine; being Epiphanius asserts the first author of it, *στέλλεσθαι τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα περὶ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, to have gone to Jerusalem even about the Apostles' times. [adv. Hær. lib. ii. tom. ii. §. 3. vol. i. p. 620 A.] Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, (not Urbicus, as St. Augustin,) who disseminated this heresy in the days of Aurelianus or Probus the

Whereas there is no nature originally sinful, no substance in itself evil, and therefore no being which may not come from the

Emperor, about the year 277, had a predecessor, though not a master, called first Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and estate to a widow, who, saith Epiphanius, ἔμεινε πολλῷ τῷ χρόνῳ οὗτως, [p. 621 B.] continued with his estate and books a long time, and at last bought Cubricus for her servant. This Buddas had a former master called Scythianus, the first author of this heresy. Beside these, between Scythianus and Cubricus there was yet another teacher of the doctrine, called Zaranes. Ἦν δὲ πρὸ τούτου (Μάνητος) καὶ ἕτερος τῆς κακίας διδάσκαλος ταύτης, Ζαράνης ὀνόματι, ὁμόφρων αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων. If then we insert this Zaranes into the Manichæan pedigree, and consider the time of the widow between Buddas and Cubricus, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but seven years old, as Socrates [i. 22. p. 55] testifies, when she resolved to buy him, and discover the heresy to him; there will be no reason to doubt of the relation of Epiphanius, that Scythianus began about the Apostolical times. Nor need we any of the abatements in the animadversions of Petavius, much less that redargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an assertor of the Christian faith against this heresy; for though he certainly died before Manes spread his doctrine, yet it was written in several books before him, not only in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates and Suidas attribute them, but of Scythianus, whom St. Cyril and Epiphanius make the author of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manichæans before the appearance of Manes: for I conceive the name of Manes (thought by the Greeks to be a name taken up by Cubricus, and proper to him) not to be any proper or peculiar name at all, but the general title of Heretic in the Syriac tongue. For I am loath to think that Theodoret or the author in Suidas were so far mistaken, when they call Scythianus *Manes*, as to conceive Cubricus and he were the same person; when we may with much better reason conclude that both Scythianus and Cubricus had the same title. For I conceive *Manes* at first rather a title than a name, from the Hebrew מין or מינאי signifying a Heretic. And although some of the Rabbins derive their מין from Manes, yet others make it more ancient than he was, referring it to Tzadok and Bajethos, called ראשי המינים *the first* or *chief heretics*, who lived 100 years before Christ. [Buxtorf. Lex. Rab. sub מין.] Wherefore it is far more rational to assert, that he which began the heresy of the Manichees was called מין as an Heretic in the Oriental tongues, and from thence Μάνης by the Greeks, (to comply with μανία or madness in their language,) than that Μάνης was first the name of a man counted an heretic by the Christians, and then made the general name for all heretics, and particularly for the Christians by the Jews *. Which being granted, both Scythianus and Cubricus might well at first have the name of Manes, that is, Heretic. However the antiquity of that heresy will appear in the Marcionites, who differed not in this particular from the Manichees. 'Duos Ponticus Deos affert, tanquam duas Symplegadas naufragii sui: quem negare non potuit, id est, creatorem, id est, nostrum; et quem probare non poterit, id est, suum. Passus infelix hujus præsumptionis instinctum de simplici capitulo Dominicæ pronunciationis, in homines non in Deos disponentis exempla illa bonæ et malæ arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [p. 366 B.] This Marcion lived in the days of Antoninus Pius, and, as Eusebius testifieth, Justin Martyr wrote against him. *Hist. lib.* iv. *cap.* 11. [p. 157.] Irenæus relates how he spake with Polycarpus Bishop of Smyrna, who was taught by the Apostles, and conversed with divers which saw our Saviour, *lib.* iii. *cap.* 3. [c. 4. p. 176.] Nei-

* [Beausobre derives Manes and Manichæus from *Manaem* or *Manachem*, a Comforter, in Persian. *Hist. de Manichée*, vol. i. p. 69.]

Isa. xlv. 7. same fountain of goodness. *I form the light, and create darkness;* 5. *I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things,* saith he who also said, *I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me.* Vain then is that conceit which framed two gods, one of them called Light, the other Darkness; one good, the other evil; refuted in the first words of the Creed, *I believe in God, Maker of heaven and earth.*

But as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we yet farther shew that one God the Father to be the Maker of the world. In which there is no difficulty at all: the whole church at Jerusalem hath sufficiently declared this truth Acts iv. 24, 27. in their devotions: *Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pi-* 63 *late with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* Jesus then was the child of that God which made the heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the Creator of the world.

We know that Christ is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave* him, by his frequent assertion: we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of Christ is the Creator of the world, by Isa. xlii. 5, 6. the Prophet's express prediction: For *thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he which spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee*

ther was Marcion the first which taught it at Rome, for he received it from Cerdon. 'Habuit et Cerdonem quendam informatorem scandali hujus, quo facilius duos Deos cæci existimaverunt.' This Cerdon succeeded Heracleon, and so at last this heresy may be reduced to the Gnostics, who derived it from the old Gentile Philosophers, and might well be embraced by Manes in Persia, because it was the doctrine of the Persian Magi, as Aristotle testifieth: 'Αριστοτέλης ἐν πρώτῳ περὶ φιλοσοφίας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους (τοὺς Μάγους) εἶναι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, καὶ δύο κατ' αὐτοὺς εἶναι ἀρχὰς, ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα καὶ κακὸν δαίμονα. *Laert. in Proœmio.* [§. 8.] And this derivation is well observed by Timotheus, Presbyter of Constantinople, speaking thus of Manes: Παρὰ δὲ Μαρκίωνος τ ν πρὸ ἐκείνου αἰσχροποιῶν καὶ δυσσεβῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ Περσίδα μάγων ἀφορμὰς λαβὼν δογματίζει δύο ἀρχάς†.

* [The meaning of *gave* in this place may be seen in the end of the following quotation.]

† [The subject of this note is illustrated by Wolfius, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos:* and the history of Manes is most fully discussed by Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme.* Concerning the words, *Maker of heaven and earth,* being added to the Creed on account of the Gnostics, see King on the Creed, p. 93, &c]

in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty: for being the Apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the Prophets that by the Spirit they were produced, how can we attribute that peculiarity in the Creed unto the Father, which in the Scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be rendered of this peculiar attributing the work of creation to the Father. First, in respect of those heresies arising in the infancy of the Church, which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another Creator of the world, distinguished from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An error so destructive to the Christian religion, that it raseth even the foundations of the Gospel, which refers itself wholly to the promises in the Law, and pretends to no other God, but that God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, than him that spake by the Prophets: and therefore whom Moses and the Prophets call Lord of heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoicing in spirit, and saying, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* Luke x. 21. Secondly, in respect of the paternal priority of the Deity, by reason whereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first Person in the Trinity. In which respect the Apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production: *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* 1 Cor. viii. 6. And our Saviour hath acknowledged, *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do;* John v 19. which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the Person. And in this sense the Church did always profess to believe in God the Father, Creator[18] of heaven and earth.

The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth several ways, as indispensably tending to the illustration of God's glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the aversion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

18 'Stabat fides semper in Creatore et Christo ejus.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 21. [p. 375 D.] 'Non alia agnoscenda erit traditio Apostolorum, quam quæ hodie apud ipsorum Ecclesias editur. Nullam autem Apostolici census Ecclesiam invenias quæ non in Creatore christianizet.' *Ibid.*

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective; and the splendour of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his
Rom. i. 20. hands. *The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even*
Jer. x. 12: li. 15. *his eternal power and Godhead.* For *he hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.* After a long enumeration of the wonderful works of the creation, the Psalmist breaketh
Ps. civ. 24. forth into this pious meditation; *O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.* If then the glory of
Prov. xvi. 4. God be made apparent by the creation, if he have *made all things for himself*, that is, for the manifestation of his glorious
Ps. civ. 31. attributes, if the *Lord rejoiceth in his works*, because *his glory* 66 *shall endure for ever;* then is it absolutely necessary we should confess him *Maker of heaven and earth*, that we may sufficiently
Ps. cxlviii. 13. praise and glorify him. *Let them praise the name of the Lord*, saith David, *for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven.* Thus did the Levites teach the children of
Neh. ix. 5, 6. Israel to glorify God: *Stand up and bless the Lord your God for ever and ever: and blessed be thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise. Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein.* And the same hath
Rom. xi. 36. St. Paul taught us: *For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen.* Furthermore, that we may be assured that he which made both heaven and earth will be glorified in both, the Prophet calls upon all those
Ps. cxlviii. 2, 3, 4, 5. celestial hosts to bear their part in his hymn: *Praise ye him all his angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him sun and moon, praise him all ye stars of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded, and they were created.*
Rev. iv. 10, 11. And the twenty-four Elders in the Revelation of St. John, *fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns,* the emblems of their borrowed and derived glories, *before the throne,* the seat of infinite and eternal majesty, *saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.* Wherefore,
Ps. xix. 1. if *the heavens declare the glory of God,* and *all his works praise*

him; then *shall his saints bless him; they shall speak of the glory of his kingdom, and talk of his power.* And if man be silent, God will speak; while we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate: *I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm.* Ps. cxlv. 10, 11. Jer. xxvii. 5.

Secondly, The doctrine of the world's creation is most properly effectual towards man's humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity than pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone than that; so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, than a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflection upon our own original. *When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained;* when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glass find greater numbers before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more, which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I contemplate those far more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the Prophet, *What is man, that thou art mindful of him?* what is that offspring of the earth, that dust and ashes? *what is that son of man, that thou visitest him?* what is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned father, that thou shouldest look down from heaven, the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our original ought so far to humble us, how should our fall abase us? that of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his Maker, and would be equal unto him from whom he new received his being. All other works of God, which we think inferior to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending of their Maker: the glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entered upon the greatest happiness, of which the workmanship of God is capable: but men, the sons of fallen Adam, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the only companions of those angels *which left their own habitations,* and are Ps. viii 3. Ps. viii. 4. 67 Jude 6.

2 Pet. ii. 4. *delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.* How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption, mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in the sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance? How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded Gen. vi. 6. by Moses, who first penned the original of humanity, *It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart?*

Thirdly, This doctrine is properly efficacious and productive of most cheerful and universal obedience. It made the Prophet call for the commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know Ps. cxix. 73. what he should obey: *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments.* By virtue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most exact and complete obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of God's goodness, none ever disobeyed his voice but the Devil and man. Isa. xlviii. 13. *Mine hand,* saith he, *hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens; when I call unto them, they stand up together.* The most loyal and obedient servants, which stand continually before the most illustrious prince, are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their sovereign lord, as all the hosts of heaven and earth to attend Isa. xl. 26. upon the will of their Creator. *Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth,* but every one maketh his appearance, ready pressed to observe the designs of their Judg. v. 20. commander in chief. Thus the Lord commanded, and *they fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.* 1 Kings xvii. 4, 6. He *commanded the ravens to feed Elias, and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening;* and so one Prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the fowls Jonah ii. 10. of the air. He spake to the devouring whale, *and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land;* and so another Prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the fishes of the sea. Ps. cxlviii. 8. Do we not read of *fire and hail, snow and vapour, stormy wind fulfilling his word?* Shall there be a greater coldness in man

than in the snow? more vanity in us than in a vapour? more inconstancy than in the wind? If the universal obedience of the creature to the will of the Creator cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him, they will all conspire to testify against us and condemn us, when God shall call unto them, saying, *Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.* Isa. i. 2.

Lastly, The creation of the world is of most necessary meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions: *Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, which made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is.* Ps. cxlvi. 5, 6. This happiness consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfy us. *The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.* Ps. xxiv. 1, 2. By virtue of the first production he hath a perpetual right unto, and power to dispose of all things: and he which can order and dispose of all, must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and
68 satisfy any creature. *Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?* Isa. xl. 28. There is no external resistance or opposition where Omnipotency worketh, no internal weakness or defection of power where the Almighty is the agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm persuasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again, this happiness consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us. *My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth: he will not suffer thy foot to be moved,* Ps. cxxi. 2, 3. saith the Prophet David; at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security. God *will not despise the work of his hands,* Job x. 3. neither will he suffer the rest of his creatures to do the least injury to his own image. *Behold,* saith he, *I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. (No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.)* Isa. liv. 16, 17.

Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first Article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof; that every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession

of my faith in the *Maker of heaven and earth,* I do truly profess, that I really believe, and am fully persuaded, that both heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation; so that antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the world merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alleged, no motive assigned, but his goodness; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within one hundred and thirty generations of men, most certainly within not more than six, or at farthest seven, thousand years*. I acknowledge this God Creator of the world to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: and in this full latitude, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*

ARTICLE II.

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

THE second Article of the Creed presents unto us, as the object of our faith, the second Person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and the Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually expressed by a constant conjunction in our Christian Confession. And that upon no less authority than of *the Author and Finisher of our faith,* who in the persons of the Apostles
John xiv. 1. gave this command to us, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* Nor speaketh he this of himself, but from the Father which sent
1 John iii. 23. him: for *this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ.* According therefore to the Son's prescription, the Father's injunction, and the sacramental institution, as we are baptized, so do we believe in the name of the Father and the Son[19].

[19] 'Eadem regula veritatis docet nos credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei, Christum Jesum, Dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei Filium; hujus Dei qui

* [In the first edition, "most certainly within much less than six thousand "years."]

Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a threefold description: first, by his nomination, as *Jesus Christ;* secondly, by his generation, as the *only Son* of God; thirdly, by his dominion, as *our Lord.*

But when I refer *Jesus Christ* to the nomination of our
69 Saviour, because he is in the Scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called *Jesus,* sometimes *Christ,* I would be understood so as not to make each of them equally, or in like propriety, his name. *His name was called Jesus, which* Luke ii. 21. *was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb: who is* also *called Christ,* not by name[20], but by office and title. Matt. i. 16. Which observation, seemingly trivial, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the Article; for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, and so resolve our faith into these two propositions; I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance, Jesus, the Saviour of the world. I believe the man who bare that name to be the Christ, that is, the Messias promised of old by God, and expected by the Jews.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the custom of the Jews, at his circumcision; and as the Baptist was called John, even so the Christ was called Jesus. Besides, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name itself of ordinary use. We read in the Scriptures of *Jesus which was called Justus,* Col. iv. 11. *a fellow-worker* with St. Paul, and of a *certain sorcerer, a Jew,* Acts xiii. 6. *whose name was Bar-jesus*[21], that is, the Son of Jesus. Josephus

et unus et solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omnium.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 9.* [p. 711 C.]

20 'Si tamen nomen est *Christus,* et non appellatio potius; *Unctus* enim significatur. Unctus autem non magis nomen est quam vestitus, quam calceatus, accidens nomini res.' *Tertul. adv. Prax. cap.* 28. [p. 517 B.] 'Quorum nominum alterum est proprium, quod ab Angelo impositum est; alterum accidens, quod ab unctione convenit.' *Ibid.* '*Christus* commune dignitatis est nomen. *Jesus* proprium vocabulum Salvatoris.' *S. Hieron. in Matt.* xvi. 20. [vol. vii. p. 125 C.] '*Jesus* inter homines nominatur; nam *Christus* non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis et regni.' *Lactan. de ver. Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [vol. i. p. 257.] 'Dum dicitur *Christus,* commune nomen dignitatis est; dum *Jesus Christus,* proprium vocabulum Salvatoris est.' *Isidor. Hisp. Orig. lib.* vii. *cap.* 2. [p. 54 G.] 'Ἰησοῦς καλεῖται φερωνύμως. *S. Cyril. Catech.* 10. [§. 4. p. 138 A.]

21 'Habuit et Judæa quosdam Jesus, quorum vacuis gloriatur vocabulis. Illa enim nec lucent, nec pascunt, nec medentur.' *Bernard. in Cant. Serm.* 15. [p. 783 H.]

* [The Eastern Creeds read, *and in one Jesus Christ,* which was probably directed against the Gnostics, who made Jesus and Christ to be two distinct persons.]

in his history mentioneth one Jesus the son of Ananus, another the son of Saphates, a third the son of Judas, slain in the temple: and many of the high-priests or priests were called by that name; as the son of Damnæus, of Gamaliel, of Onias, of Phabes, and of Thebuth. Ecclesiasticus is called the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and that Sirach the son of another Jesus.

Acts vii. 45. St. Stephen speaks of the *tabernacle of witness brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles:* and the Apostle in his explication of those words of David, *To-day if you will hear his*

Heb. iv. 8. *voice,* observeth, that, *if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day.* Which two Scriptures being undoubtedly understood of Joshua, the son of Nun, teach us as infallibly that *Jesus* is the same name with *Joshua.* Which being at the first imposition[22] in the full extent of pronunciation *Jehoshua,* in process of time contracted to *Jeshuah,* by the omission of the last letter, (strange and difficult to other languages,) and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Jesus.*

Wherefore it will be necessary, for the proper interpretation of *Jesus,* to look back upon the first that bare that name, who was the son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the successor of

Numb. xiii. 16. Moses, and so named by him, as it is written, *and Moses called Oshea the son of Nun, Jehoshua.* His first name then imposed at his circumcision was Oshea, or Hoseah: the same with the

1 Chron. xxvii. 20. 2 Kings xvii. 1. Hos. i. 1. name of the *son of Azaziah,* ruler of Ephraim, of the *son of Elah,* king of Israel, of the *son of Beeri,* the Prophet: and the interpretation of this first name Hoseah[23], is *Saviour.* Now we must

22 First יהושע as generally in the books of Moses, in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, the Kings, yea even in Haggai and Zechariah: then contracted into ישוע, as in 1 Chron. xxiv. 11. 2 Chron. xxxi. 15. and constantly in Ezra and Nehemiah. Next the last letter ע was but lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek translation, 1 Chron. vii. 27. where יהושע is rendered in the Roman and Alexandrian copies Ἰησουέ, in the Aldus and Complutensian editions Ἰωσηέ, and by Eusebius, who expresseth it truer than those copies, Ἰωσουέ. At last ע was totally left out, both in the pronunciation and the writing, and the whole name of Joshua contracted to ישו.

23 'Osee in lingua nostra *salvatorem* sonat, quod nomen habuit etiam Josue filius Nun, antequam ei a Deo vocabulum mutaretur.' *S. Hier. in Osee, cap.* 1. *ver.* 1. [vol. vi. p. 1 B.] *et lib.* i. *adv. Jovinianum.* [vol. ii. p. 270 A.] I read indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks, no good expositors of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient MS. of the LXX. translation of the Prophets, now in the library of Cardinal Barberini, at the beginning of Hoseah, Ὡσηὲ, λυπούμενος· and again, Ὡσηὲ, σεσωσμένος, ἢ συσκιάζων· (of which the first and last are far from the original: and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduced from ישע not in Niphal, but in Hiphil.) And in another MS. of the Prophets in the King's library at St. James's, Ὡσηὲ, σκιάζων ἢ φύλης· and again, Ὡσηὲ, ἑρμ. σωζόμενος, which is the interpretation

70 not imagine this to be no mutation[24], neither must we look upon it as a total alteration[25], but observe it as a change not trivial or inconsiderable[26]. And being Hoseah was a name afterwards used by some, and Jehoshua, as distinct, by others, it will necessarily follow there was some difference between these two names; and it will be fit to inquire what was the addition, and in what the force of the alteration doth consist.

First therefore we observe, that all the original letters in the name Hoseah are preserved in that of Joshua; from whence it is evident that this alteration was not made by a verbal mutation, as when Jacob was called Israel, nor by any literal change, as when Sarai was named Sarah, nor yet by diminution or mutilation; but by addition, as when Abram was called Abraham. הושע יהושע

inserted into Hesychius; in whom for Ὡσήρ we must read Ὡσηέ· and so I suppose Salmasius intended it, though the Holland edition hath made his emendation Ὡσκέ.

24 As the Samaritan Pentateuch makes it the same name, which he was first named, and which he had afterwards, as if Moses had only called Oshea, Oshea.

25 So Justin Martyr speaks of *Hoseah* as μετονομασθέντος τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι· [Dial. cum Tryph. p. 225 A.] and comparing it with that alteration of Jacob's name; τὸ ἐπώνυμον Ἰακὼβ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπικληθέντι ἐδόθη, καὶ τὸ Αὐσῆ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦς ἐπεκλήθη· [Ibid. p. 201 A.] where, to pass by his mistake in supposing him first named Israel, and after called Jacob, he makes the alteration of *Hoseah* to *Joshua* equal to that of *Jacob* to *Israel*. The reason whereof was the Greek version of the name, who for *Hoseah* translated it Αὐσῆς· Ἐπωνόμασε Μωυσῆς τὸν Αὐσῆ υἱὸν Ναυῆ, Ἰησοῦν. Numb. xiii. 16. 'Quum successor Moysi destinaretur Auses filius Nave, transfertur certe de pristino nomine, et incipit vocari Jesus.' *Tertul. adv. Jud. cap.* 9. [p. 195 D.] *et adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 16. [p. 406 B.] 'Igitur Moyses his administratis Ausem quendam nomine præponens populo, qui eos revocaret ad patriam terram.' *Clem. Rom. Recognit. lib.* i. [c. 38. vol. i. p. 502.] 'Qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moses futura præsentiens, jussit eum Jesum vocari.' *Lactan. de vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 17. [vol. i. p. 288.] Οὐ πρότερον γοῦν (Μωϋσῆς) τὸν αὐτοῦ διάδοχον τῇ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεχρημένον προσηγορίᾳ, ὀνόματι δὲ ἑτέρῳ τῷ Αὐσῇ, ὅπερ οἱ γεννήσαντες αὐτῷ τέθεινται, καλούμενον, Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς ἀναγορεύει. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib.* i. *c.* 3. [p. 11.] Thus was the *Hoseah* something disguised by *Auses*, and was farther estranged yet by those which frequently called him Ναυσῆς, as Eusebius, *Dem. Evang. lib.* v. *cap.* 17. thrice.

26 This Justin Martyr charges upon the Jews as neglected by them, and affirms the reason why they received not Jesus for the Christ, was their not observing the alteration of *Hoseah* into *Josua* or *Jesus*. Αὐσὴν καλούμενον—Ἰησοῦν Μωσῆς ἐκάλεσε· τοῦτο σὺ οὐ ζητεῖς, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐποίησεν, οὐκ ἀπορεῖς, οὐδὲ φιλοπευστεῖς· τοιγαροῦν λέληθέ σε ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκων οὐ συνίης. [Dial. cum Tryph. 113. p. 206 A.] And whereas they spake much of the change made in the names of Abram and Sarai, which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this total alteration of the name: so he; Διὰ τί μὲν ἓν ἄλφα πρώτῳ προσετέθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνόματι θεολογεῖς, καὶ διὰ τί ἓν ῥῶ τῷ Σάρρας ὀνόματι, ὁμοίως κομπολογεῖς· διὰ τί δὲ τὸ πατρόθεν ὄνομα τῷ Αὐσῇ τῷ υἱῷ Ναυῆ ὅλον μετωνόμασται τῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὐ ζητεῖς. [Ibid.] Where, to pass by the vulgar mistake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of *a* in the name of Abraham, and *ρ* in the name of Sarah, when the first was an addition of ה, the second a change of י into ה, he would make that of *Hosea* into *Jesus* a far more considerable alteration than that of *Abraham* or of *Sarah*.

Secondly it must be confessed that there is but one literal addition, and that of that letter which is most frequent in the Hebrew names: but being thus solemnly added by Moses, upon so remarkable an occasion as the viewing of the land of Canaan was, and that unto a name already known, and after used; it cannot be thought to give any less than a present designation[27] of his person to be a Saviour of the people, and future certainty of salvation included in his name unto the Israelites by his means. Thirdly, though the number of the letters be augmented actually but to one, yet it is not improbable that another may be virtually added, and in the signification understood. For being the first letter of Hoseah will not endure a duplication, and if the same letter were to be added, one of them must be absorpt; it is possible another of the same might be by Moses intended, and one of them suppressed. If then unto the name Hoseah we join one of the titles of God, which is *Jah*, there will result from both, by the custom of that Hebrew tongue, Jehoshua; and so not only the instrumental[28], but also the

27 For it may well be thought that י is added to make the name יהושע the same with the third person of the future in Hiphil, יהושיע. For although ה the characteristical letter of the conjugation Hiphil be excluded in the future tense, and so the regular word be יושיע frequently in use; yet sometimes it is expressed, as it is used, 1 Sam. xvii. 47, לא בחרב ובחנית יהושיע יהוה *And all the assembly shall know that the Lord saveth* (or *will save*) *not with sword and spear:* and Ps. cxvi. 6. דלותי ולי יהושיע *I was brought low, and he helped me.* And although there be another י in the future than in the name, yet being it is also found sometimes with the lesser Chiric, and so without the latter י, or without any Chiric at all, as frequently with the addition of ו, ויושע, there is no reason but יהושע, the name of the son of Nun, may be of the same force, as consisting of the same letters, with the third person of the future in Hiphil. Again, being י added to the future, as formative thereof, stands in the place of ו (for the avoiding of confusion with ו conjunctive) which is nothing else than the abbreviation of הוא, we may well assign at least this emphasis to the mutation which Moses made: that whereas before there was nothing but salvation barely in his name, now there is no less than *he shall save*, in which the הוא or י is a peculiar designation of the person, and the *shall* or tense a certainty of the futurition. Thus will the design of Moses appear to be nothing else but a prediction or confirmation of that which was not before, but by way of desire or omination; and this only by changing the imperative into the future, הושע *serva*, the expectation of the people, into יהושע *servabit*, the ratification of Moses.

28 So did the ancients understand it: to the Greeks *Jesus* is Σωτήριον Θεοῦ, to the Latins, *Salvator Dei*. So Eusebius, *Dem. Evang. lib.* iv. *ad finem.* [c. 17. p. 199 D.] Ἐπεὶ δὲ σωτήριον Θεοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μεταληφθὲν ὄνομα σημαίνει. Ἰσουὰ μὲν γὰρ παρ' Ἑβραίοις, σωτηρία, υἱὸς δὲ Ναυῆ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἰωσουὲ ὀνομάζεται· Ἰωσουὲ δέ ἐστιν Ἰαὼ σωτηρία, τοῦτ' ἔστι, Θεοῦ σωτήριον. Where nothing can be more certain than that Ἰαώ is taken for the name of God, and Ἰαὼ σωτηρία, together, *the salvation of God.* And yet Theophylact has strangely mistaken it, Matt. i. 1. Τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὄνομα οὐχ Ἑλληνικόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' Ἑβραϊκὸν, ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ σωτὴρ, Ἰαὼ γὰρ ἡ σωτηρία παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις λέγεται.

original cause of the Jews' deliverance will be found expressed in one word: as if Moses had said, this is the person by whom God will save his people from their enemies.

71 Now being we have thus declared that Jesus is the same name with Josuah; being the name of Josuah was first imposed by Divine designation, as a certain prediction of the fulfilling to the Israelites, by the person which bare the name, all which was signified by the name; being Jesus was likewise named by a more immediate imposition from heaven, even by the ministration of an Angel; it followeth, that we believe he was infallibly designed by God to perform unto the sons of men whatsoever is implied in his nomination. As therefore in Hoseah there was expressed salvation, in Josuah at least was added the designation of that single person to save, with certainty of preservation, and probably even the name of God, by whose appointment and power he was made a Saviour; so shall we find the same in Jesus. In the first salutation, the Angel Gabriel told the blessed Virgin, she should *conceive in her womb, and* Luke i. 31. *bring forth a Son,* and should call *his name Jesus.* In the dream of Joseph the Angel of the Lord informed him not only of the nomination, but of the interpretation or etymology[29]; *Thou* Matt. i. 21. *shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.* In which words is clearly expressed the designation of the person, *He,* and the futurition of salvation certain by him, *he shall save.* Beside, that other addition of the name of God,

[p. 4 A.] which words seem plainly to signify that *Jesus* is interpreted *Saviour,* because Ἰαώ in the Hebrew tongue signifieth *salvation.* I confess the words may be strained to the same sense with those of Eusebius, but not without some force, and contrary to what he seemeth to intend. Especially considering those which followed him in the same mistake, as Moschopulus, Περὶ σχεδῶν. Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰαὼ γίνεται, ὃ δηλοῖ παρ' Ἑβραίοις τὴν σωτηρίαν. Whereas Ἰαώ in Eusebius is certainly no other than יהוה, and Ἰσουά than ישועה, and so Ἰωσουέ contracted of Ἰαὼ Ἰσουά, *the salvation of God.* Nor is this only the opinion of Eusebius, but of St. Hierom, a man much better acquainted with the Hebrew language; who, on the first chapter of Hoseah, shewing that Josua had first the same name with that of the Prophet, saith, 'Non enim (ut male in Græcis codicibus legitur et Latinis) *Ause* dictus est, quod nihil omnino intelligitur, sed *Osee,* id est, *Salvator:* et additum est ejus nomini *Dominus,* ut *Salvator Domini* diceretur.' [vol. vi. p. 1 C.] What then was it but יה the *Dominus* added to his name? For as in the name of Esaias, St. Hierom acknowledgeth the addition of the name of God, 'Interpretatur autem *Esaias, Salvator Domini;*' [vol. iv. p. 9 D.] in the same manner did he conceive it in the name of Joshuah, only with this difference, that in the one it begins, in the other concludes, the name.

29 '*Jesus* Hebræo sermone Salvator dicitur. Etymologiam ergo nominis ejus Evangelista signavit, dicens, *Vocabis nomen ejus Jesum, quia ipse salvum faciet populum suum.*' *S. Hieron.* [in Matt. i. 21. vol. vii. p. 13 B.]

propounded in Josuah as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons. First, because it is not barely said that *He*, but as the original raiseth it, *He himself shall save*. Josuah saved Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God: whereas Jesus himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God. Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour*. Secondly, immediately upon the prediction of the name of Jesus, and the interpretation given by the Angel, the Evangelist expressly observeth, *All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us*. Several ways have been invented to shew the fulfilling of that prophecy, notwithstanding our Saviour was not called Emmanuel; but none can certainly appear more proper, than that the sense of *Emmanuel* should be comprehended in the name of *Jesus:* and what else is *God with us*, than *God our Saviour?* Well therefore hath the Evangelist conjoined the Prophet and the Angel[30], asserting Christ was therefore named Jesus, because it was foretold he should be called Emmanuel, the angelical *God the Saviour*, being in the highest propriety the prophetical *God with us*.

Αὐτός, ipse.

Matt. i. 22, 23.

However, the constant Scripture-interpretation of this name is *Saviour*. So said the angel of the Lord to the amazed shepherds, *Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord*. So St. Paul to the Jews and Gentile proselytes at Antioch, *Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus*. Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world, than was the name itself so often used before. For the ancient Grecians usually gave it at first as a title to their gods[31],

Luke ii. 11.

Acts xiii. 23.

72

30 Βλέπεις ἰσαρίθμους εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ προφήτου ῥήσεις; μεθερμηνευόμενον γὰρ τὸ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ὅ ἐστι σωτηρία λαοῦ, τὸ μετὰ δούλων δεσπότην ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν. *Andreas Cretensis in Circumc.* [p. 30 D. ed. 1644.]

31 Jupiter, the chief of them, was most usually worshipped under this title. Euripides makes Amphitryo sitting by his altar, which Hercules had built,—

Βωμὸν καθίζω τόνδε Σωτῆρος Διός·
Herc. Fur. v. 48.

and Aristophanes introduces Bacchus swearing,

Νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν Σωτῆρα·———
Plut. v. 878.

as if it were the familiar oath among the Athenians, as well it might be, he having his temple in their Piræum, as Strabo testifieth, *lib.* ix. [§. 15. p. 396.] (where Demosthenes by virtue of a de-

whom after any remarkable preservations they styled Saviours,

cree was to build him an altar, *Plutarch. in Vita Demosth.*) and his porch in the city, which was called indeed vulgarly, τοῦ Ἐλευθερίου Διὸς στοά· yet was it also named τοῦ Σωτῆρος, as Harpocration and Hesychius have observed. Ὅτι δὲ ἐπιγέγραπται μὲν Σωτὴρ, ὀνομάζεται δὲ καὶ Ἐλευθέριος, δηλοῖ καὶ Μένανδρος· so the first: Τῶν Μήδων ἐκφυγόντες ἱδρύσαντο τὸν Ἐλευθέριον Διὰ, τοῦτον δὲ ἔνιοι καὶ Σωτῆρά φασι· so the latter. As in their oaths, so in their feasts, they mentioned him always at the third cup. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ Θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἔλεγον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἡρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σωτῆρος, scil. Διός· which is omitted in Hesychius, as appears out of Athenæus, *lib.* ii. *et* xv. and especially that of Alexis the comedian: [lib. xv. p. 693 A.]

——— Ἀλλ' ἔγχεον
Αὐτῷ Διός γε τήνδε Σωτῆρος. θεῶν
Θνητοῖς ἁπάντων χρησιμώτατος πολὺ
Ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ Σωτήρ. ———

Pausanias in *Corinthiacis, Messenicis, Laconicis et Arcadicis*, mentions several statues and temples anciently dedicated to Jupiter, ἐπίκλησιν Σωτῆρι· of which title Cornutus in his book *De Natura Deorum* [p. 71.] gives this account: Κατὰ τὸν γεννῶντά ἐστι καὶ τὸ σώζειν ἃ γεννᾷ, καὶ τοῦ Διὸς ἐντεῦθεν Σωτῆρος εἶναι λεγομένου. And though this title was so generally given to Jupiter, as that Hesychius expounds Σωτήρ, ὁ Ζεύς, yet was it likewise attributed to the other gods: as Herodotus relates how the Grecians in their naval war against the Persians made their vows Ποσειδέωνι Σωτῆρι, and that they preserved the title to Neptune in his days, *lib.* vii. [c. 192.] And Artemidorus takes notice that Castor and Pollux are taken for the Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες, whom the poem bearing the name of Orpheus to Musæus calls

Μεγάλους Σωτῆρας δμοῦ, Διὸς ἄφθιτα τέκνα· [v. 21.]

as the Hymn of Homer, [ad Diosc. 6.]

Σωτῆρας τέκε παῖδας ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Ὠκυπόρων τε νεῶν ———

and Theocritus in the Idyllion on them,

Ἀνθρώπων Σωτῆρας ἐπὶ ξυνοῦ ἤδη ἐόντων. [Idyll. xxii. 6.]

Hence Lucian *in Alexandro* [c. 4.] useth it as their constant title, Ἀλεξίκακε Ἡράκλεις, καὶ Ζεῦ ἀποτρόπαιε, καὶ Διόσκουροι Σωτῆρες. Neither have we mention of the title only, but of the original and occasion of it. For when Castor and Pollux thrust the sons of Theseus out of Athens, and made Menestheus king, he gave them first this name; Διὰ ταῦτα πρῶτος ὁ Μενεσθεὺς ἀνακτάς τε καὶ σωτῆρας ὠνόμασε. *Ælian. Var. Hist. lib.* iv. *cap.* 5. Beside these we read in the ancient inscriptions, Ἀσκληπιῷ Θεῷ Σωτῆρι· and again, Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ Ὑγείᾳ Σωτῆρσι. For as they had their Female Deities, so did they attribute this title to their Goddesses, and that both in the masculine and feminine gender. As to Venus, Ἀφροδίτῃ Θεᾷ Παναγάθῳ καὶ Σωτῆρι· to Diana, Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτείρι, as the same collection of Inscriptions hath it. Thus Pherecrates, Ἡγούμεθα τῆς πόλεως εἶναι ταύτας Σωτῆρας, and Sophocles, Τύχῃ γε τῷ Σωτῆρι. [O. T. 80.] Thus the Epigram extant in Suidas, [s. v. κλῆρος,]

Φωσφόρος, ὦ Σώτειρ', ἐπὶ Παλλάδος ἵσταθι κλήρων,
Ἄρτεμι ———

Οὐδὲν ἧττον κἀκεῖνον Σωτῆρα καὶ ἀλεξίκακον προσηγόρευον. *Theodoret. Serm.* viii. [vol. iv. p. 595 C.] of Hercules. The Bæenses, an ancient people in Peloponnesus, Ἄρτεμιν ὀνομάζουσι Σώτειραν. *Paus. in Laconicis.* Her temple and statue in the city Trœzen was built and named by Theseus at his safe return from Crete. The Megarenses preserved by her from the Persians, ἐπὶ τόδε Σωτείρας ἄγαλμα ἐποιήσαντο Ἀρτέμιδος· and upon the same occasion another of the same bigness set up at Pagæ. *Idem.* But this title especially was given to Minerva. Σώτειρα, ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. *Hesych.* Ἔστι γὰρ Ἀθήνῃσι Ἀθηνᾶ Σώτειρα λεγομένη, ᾗ καὶ θύουσι. *Schol. Aristoph. in Ranas.* [v. 381.] Aristotle in his will obliged Nicanor to a dedication, Διὶ Σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Σωτείρῃ. *Laert. in Vita Aristot.* [lib. v. §. 16.] And in general they invocated God under the notion of Σωτήρ, as Plato *in Timæo*, Θεὸν δὲ καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἀρχῇ τῶν λεγομένων Σωτῆρα ἐξ ἀτόπου καὶ ἀήθους διηγήσεως πρὸς τὸ τῶν εἰκότων δόγμα διασώζειν ἡμᾶς ἐπικαλεσάμενοι, πάλιν ἀρχόμεθα λέγειν. [p. 48 D.]

and under that notion built temples, and consecrated altars to them. Nor did they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop unto their baser flattery, calling those men their Saviours [32], for whom they seemed to have as great respect and honour as for their gods.

Nor does it always signify so much as that it may not be attributed to man; for even in the Scriptures the judges of Judg. iii. 9. Israel were called no less than their Saviours. *When the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of* Verse 15. *Kenaz.* And again, *When they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud the son of Gera.* Where though in our translation we call Othniel and Ehud *Deliverers*, yet in the original they are plainly termed *Saviours* [33].

32 This was the constant title of the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, given to him by the Rhodians: Ὀνόματα μὲν δὲ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ Πτολεμαῖοί σφισιν, ἄλλη δὲ ἐπίκλησις ἄλλῳ· καὶ γὰρ Φιλομήτορα καλοῦσι, καὶ Φιλάδελφον ἕτερον, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Λάγου Σωτῆρα, παραδόντων Ῥοδίων τὸ ὔνομα. *Pausan. Atticis* [I. c. 8.] Which name first given him by the Rhodians was no way expressed in his usage of the Syrians, as is observed by Josephus. Ὡς καὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἅπασαν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου Σωτῆρος τότε χρηματίζοντος τὰ ἐναντία παθεῖν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐπικλήσει. [*Jud. Ant.* xii. 1.] This was so familiar, that Tertullian useth the title instead of the name: 'Post eum (sc. Alexandrum) regnavit illic in Alexandria Soter annis 35.' [Adv. Judæos, c. 8. p. 190 C.] Thus Antigonus was first called by the Greeks their Εὐεργέτης, or *Benefactor*, then Σωτήρ, or *Saviour*. Οὐ μόνον ἐκρίθη παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν Εὐεργέτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταλλάξας, Σωτήρ. *Polyb. lib.* v. [c. 9.] Thus we read of Demetrius, who restored the Athenians to their liberty, Ἀνεκρότησαν καὶ βοῶντες ἐκέλευον ἀποβαίνειν τὸν Δημήτριον, Σωτῆρα καὶ Εὐεργέτην ἀναγορεύοντες. *Plutarch. in Vita:* [c. ix. vol. i. p. 892 D.]: and not only so, but numbered Demetrius and Antigonus among their *Dii Soteres;* and instead of their annual Archon, whose name they used in their distinction of years, they created a priest of these *Dii Soteres*, as the same author testifieth [c. x.): Μόνοι δὲ Σωτῆρας ἀνέγραψαν θεοὺς, καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πάτριον ἄρχοντα καταπαύσαντες, ἱερέα Σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνουν καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν. Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Babylonians. Τίμαρχον ἐπανιστάμενον ἀνελὼν, καὶ τἄλλα πονηρῶς τῆς Βαβυλῶνος ἡγούμενον, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ Σωτὴρ ἀρξαμένων τῶν Βαβυλονίων ὠνομάσθη. *De Bell. Syriac.* [c. 47.] Lucian's mistake in his Salutation tells us of Ἀντίοχος ὁ Σωτήρ, and Appian gives us the routing of the Gauls as the cause of that title: Ὃς καὶ Σωτὴρ ἐπεκλήθη Γαλάτας ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐμβαλόντας ἐξελάσας. *Ibid.* [c. 65.] And in process of time this title grew so customary and familiar, that the Sicilians bestowed it upon Verres their oppressor. 'Itaque illum non solum Patronum istius insulæ, sed etiam Sotera inscriptum vidi Syracusis,' says Cicero. *Verrin.* 2. [Act. ii. lib. ii. c. 63.]

33 Heb. ויקם יהוה מושיע לבני ישראל ויושיעם So the Septuagint clearly, Καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος Σωτῆρα τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς, τὸν Γοθονιὴλ υἱὸν Κενέζ. *Qui suscitavit eis Salvatorem, et liberavit eos, Othoniel.* Again, Καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος αὐτοῖς Σωτῆρα τὸν Ἀὼδ, υἱὸν Γηρᾶ. *Qui suscitavit eis Salvatorem vocabulo Aioth, filium Gera. Vet. Transl.* Upon which place St. Augustin notes, 'Advertendum est autem quod Salvatorem dicat etiam hominem, per quem Deus salvos faciat.' *Quæst. lib.* vii. *cap.* 18. [vol. iii. part 1. p. 601 E.]

73 Now what the full import and ultimate sense of the title of Saviour might be, seemed not easy to the ancients: and the best of the Latins thought the Greek word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the Latin tongue had no single word able to express it [34].

But whatsoever notion the heathen had of their gods or men which they styled Saviours, we know this name belongeth unto Christ in a more sublime and peculiar manner. *Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.* Acts iv. 12.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how and for what reasons Christ truly is, and properly is called, our Saviour. First then, I conceive, one sufficient cause of that appellation to

34 So Cicero in the place before cited, having said he saw Verres inscribed *Sotera*, goes on, 'Hoc quantum est? ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit.' But though in Cicero's time there was no Latin word used in that sense, yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the Greek inscriptions we read often dedications Διὶ Σωτῆρι, so in the Latin we find often *Jovi Servatori*, or *Conservatori*, sometimes *Jovi Salvatori*, or *Salutari*: all which are nothing else but the Latin expressions of the Greek inscriptions. And without question Σωτήρ might have been rendered *Sospitator*, and even *Sospes*, as it was used in the days of Ennius. 'Sospes, salvus: Ennius tamen sospitem pro servatore posuit.' *Festus.* Neither indeed could the Sicilians mean any more of Verres by the word *Sotera*, than Tully spake of himself, when he styled himself *Servatorem Reipublicæ.* At least Tacitus did conceive that *Conservator* is as much as *Soter*, when speaking of Milichus, who detected the conspiracies to Nero, he saith, 'Milichus præmiis ditatus Conservatoris sibi nomen, Græco ejus rei vocabulo, assumpsit.' *Annal. lib.* xv. [c. 71.] *He took to himself the name of Conservator, in a Greek word which signifies so much:* and without question that must be Σωτήρ. However the first Christians of the Latin church were some time in doubt what word to use as the constant interpretation of Σωτήρ, so frequent and essential to Christianity. Tertullian useth *Salutificator*, or, as some books read it, *Salvificator*: 'Ergo jam non unus Deus, nec unus Salutificator, si duo salutis artifices, et utique alter altero indigens.' *De Carne Christi, cap.* 14. [p. 319 B.] and shews it was so translated in the Philippians iii. 20. 'Et quidem de terra in cœlum, ubi nostrum municipatum Philippenses quoque ab Apostolo discunt; *Unde et Salutificatorem nostrum expectamus Jesum Christum.*' *De Resur. Carnis, cap.* 47. [p. 354 B.] St. Hilary thought *Salutaris* a sufficient interpretation. 'Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quod Jesus nuncupatur. *Jesus* enim secundum Hebraicam linguam *Salutaris* est.' *in Psal.* cxviii. Lit. xi. 1. p. 305 C.] St. Augustin is indifferent between that and *Salvator*: 'Deus salvos faciendi Dominus est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris:' [De Civ. Dei, xvii. 18. 2. vol. vii. p. 482 B.] and so Lactantius. At last they generally used the word *Salvator.* First Tertullian: 'Christus in illo significabatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem: aliis ferus, ut judex, aliis mansuetus, ut Salvator.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 18. [p. 407 C.] Which word of his was rather followed by his imitator St. Cyprian, after whom Arnobius used it, after him his disciple Lactantius: and from thence it continued the constant language of the Church, till the late innovators thrust it out of the Latin translation.

consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the only true way for the obtaining eternal salvation, and by such patefaction can deserve no less than the name of Saviour. For if those Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel, who received the way of salvation from him, which they delivered unto others, may be said to save those persons which were converted by their preaching; in a far more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. St. Paul *provoked to emulation them which were his flesh, that he might save some of them;* and *was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.* He exhorted Timothy *to take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this, he should both save himself and them that heard him.* And St. James speaks in more general terms; *Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death.* Now if these are so expressly said to save the souls of them which are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with much more reason must Christ be said to save them, whose ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he which *came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.* The will of God concerning the salvation of man was revealed by him. *No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* Being then *the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,* being they which preach it at the command of Christ are said to save the souls of such as believe their word, being it was Christ alone *who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel;* therefore he must in a most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged thereby to save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first respect, the title of Saviour.

Rom.xi.14. 1Cor.ix.22. 1 Tim. iv. 16. Jam. v. 19, 20. Eph. ii. 17. John i. 18. Rom. i. 16. 2Tim.i. 10.

Secondly, this Jesus hath not only revealed, but also procured, the way of salvation; not only delivered it to us, but also wrought it out for us; and so *God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved.* We were all concluded under sin, and, being the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternal punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that *without shedding of blood is no remission.* 74

John iii.17. Heb.ix.22, 23, 26.

It was therefore necessary that Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And so he did, for he *shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins,* as himself professeth in the sacramental institution: he *bare our sins in his own body on the tree,* as St. Peter speaks; and so in him *we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.* And if *while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him.* Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended him, there was no possible way of salvation, but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the Philistines did concerning David, *Wherewith should we reconcile ourselves unto our master?* we have no other name to answer it but Jesus. For *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* And as under the Law *the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place;* so it pleased the Father through the Son, *having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself.* And thus it comes to pass, that *us who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death.* And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the salvation of our souls. *For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.* Furthermore, we were all first enslaved by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of redemption. Now it was the law of Moses, that if *any were able he might redeem himself:* but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he which *was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him.* But this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother, but that Son of man which is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he only could, that he freely did perform. For *the Son of man came*

Matt. xxvi. 28.
1 Pet. ii. 24.
Col. i. 14.
Rom. v. 8, 9.
1 Sam. xxix. 4.
2 Cor. v. 19.
Lev. vi. 30.
Col. i. 20, 21, 22.
Rom. v. 10.
Lev. xxv. 49.
Verse 48.
Matt. xx. 28.

to give his life a ransom for many: and as he came to give, so he
1 Tim. ii. 6. *gave himself a ransom for all.* So that in him *we have redemption*
Eph. i. 7. *through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.* For we are *bought with*
1 Cor. vii. 23. *a price:* for we are *redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver*
1 Pet. i. 18, 19. *and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.* He then which hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himself as a ransom to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a far higher right unto the name of *Jesus*, unto the title of our *Saviour*.

Thirdly, beside the promulging and procuring, there is yet a farther act, which is, conferring of salvation on us. All which we mentioned before, was wrought by virtue of his death, and his appearance in the holy of holies: but we must still believe
Heb. vii. 25. he *is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by* 75
him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For now being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in heaven and earth; and the end of this power which he hath received is, to confer salvation upon those which
John xvii. 2. believe in him. For the Father gave the Son *this power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him;* that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortal to put on immortality: and upon this power we are to expect salvation
Phil. iii. 20, 21. from him. For we must *look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.* And
Heb. ix. 28. *unto them that* thus *look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation.* Being then we are all to endeavour
1 Cor. v. 5. that our *spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus;* being
Acts v. 31. St. Peter hath taught us, that *God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour;* being the conferring of that upon us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered; therefore we must acknowledge that the actual giving of salvation to us is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title *Saviour*.

Thus by the virtue of his precious blood Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all

possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the Angel of the Lord, *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins;* Matt. i. 21. well did Zacharias call him *an horn of salvation;* Simeon, *the salvation of God;* Luke i. 69. St. Paul, *the captain and author of eternal salvation;* Luke ii. 30. Heb. v. 9. St. Peter, *a Prince and a Saviour,* correspondent to those judges of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called *Saviours.* Heb. ii. 10. Acts v. 31. *In the time of their trouble,* say the Levites, *when they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them Saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.* Neh. ix. 27.

The correspondency of Jesus unto those temporal Saviours will best appear, if we consider it particularly in Josuah, who bare that salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions. For, as the son of Sirach saith, *Jesus the son of Nave was valiant in the wars, and was the successor of Moses in prophecies, who, according to his name, was made great for the saving of the elect of God.* Ecclus. xlvi. 1. Although therefore Moses was truly and really *a ruler and deliverer,* Acts vii. 35. which is the same with Saviour[35]; although the rest of the judges were also by their office rulers and deliverers, and therefore styled Saviours, as expressly Othniel and Ehud are; yet Josuah, far more particularly and exactly than the rest, is represented as a type of our Jesus, and that typical singularity manifested in his name[36]. For first, he it was alone, of all which passed out of Egypt, who was designed to lead the children of Israel into Canaan, the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey. Which land as it was a type of the heaven of heavens, the inheritance of the saints, and eternal joys flowing from the right hand of God; so is the person which brought the Israelites into that place of rest a type of him[37] who only can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare our mansions for us, and assign them to us, as Josuah divided the land for an inheritance to the tribes. Besides, it is farther

35 Ῥύστης, σωτὴρ, λυτρωτής. And again, Σωτὴρ, ὁ Ζεὺς, ὁ ἐλευθέριος ἢ λυτρωτής. *Hesych.*

36 'Quantum attinet ad propheticum apparatum, nec geri nec dici aliquid posset insignius, quandoquidem res perducta est usque ad nominis expressionem.' *S. August. cont. Faust. lib.* xvi. *cap.* 19. [vol. viii. p. 294 E.]

37 Ὃν τρόπον ἐκεῖνος εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν γῆν τὸν λαὸν, οὐχὶ Μωσῆς· καὶ ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἐν κλήρῳ διένειμεν αὐτὴν τοῖς εἰσελθοῦσι μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὕτως καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπιστρέψει, καὶ διαμεριεῖ τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν ἑκάστῳ. *Justin. Dial. cum Tryph.* [c. 113. p. 206 C.]

observable, not only what Josuah did, but what Moses could not do. The hand of Moses and Aaron brought them out of Egypt, but left them in the wilderness, and could not seat them in Canaan. Josuah, the successor, only could effect that in which Moses failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, than to take Moses for the doctrine delivered, 76
or the books written by him, that is, the Law[38]; from whence it followeth, that the death of Moses and the succession of Josuah presignified the continuance of the Law till Jesus came,

Acts xiii. 39. Luke xvi. 16. *by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses. The Law and the Prophets were until John: since that the kingdom of God is*

Rom. iii. 20, 21, 22. *preached.* Moses must die, that Josuah may succeed. *By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified, (for by the Law is the knowledge of sin;) but the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.*

Exod. xxiv. 13. Moses indeed seems to have taken Josuah with him up into the mount: but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which

[38] As Luke xvi. 29, 31. and xxiv. 27. Joh. v. 45, 46. Acts vi. 11. collated with the 13th verse; Acts xv. 21. and xxi. 21. 2 Cor. iii. 15. Μωσέα νοητέον τὸν νόμον, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ὁμώνυμον ἐκείνῳ σωτῆρα—ὥσπερ τοίνυν κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν, Μωσῆ τετελευτηκότος, Ἰησοῦς τὸν λαὸν εἰς τὴν ἐπηγγελμένην εἰσήγαγε γῆν, οὕτω μετὰ τὸ τοῦ νόμου τέλος ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐπιφανεὶς Ἰησοῦς ἀνέῳξε τῷ εὐσεβεῖ λαῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. *Theodoret. in Jos. Procem.* [vol. i. p. 194 B.] 'Dum Moysi successor destinaretur Auses filius Nave, transfertur certe de pristino nomine, et incipit vocari Jesus. Certe, inquis. Hanc prius dicimus figuram futuri fuisse. Nam quia Jesus Christus secundum populum, quod sumus nos, nationes in seculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram repromissionis melle et lacte manantem, id est, in vitæ æternæ possessionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per Moysen, id est, non per Legis disciplinam, sed per Jesum, id est, per novæ Legis gratiam, provenire habebat, circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi præceptis (petra enim Christus multis modis et figuris prædicatus est); ideo is vir qui in hujus Sacramenti imaginem parabatur, etiam nominis Dominici inauguratus est figura, ut Jesus nominaretur.' *Tertul. adv. Jud. cap.* 9. [p. 193 D.] *et adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 16. [p. 406 B.] 'Idcirco etiam Moysi successit, ut ostenderet novam legem, per Jesum Christum datam, veteri legi successuram, quæ data per Moysen fuit.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 17. [p. 288.] 'In cujus comparatione (Moyses) improbatus est, ut non ipse introduceret populum in terram promissionis; ne videlicet Lex per Moysen, non ad salvandum, sed ad convincendum peccatorem data, in regnum cœlorum introducere putaretur, sed gratia et veritas per Jesum Christum facta.' *S. August. cont. Faust. lib.* xvi. *cap.* 19. [vol. viii. p. 294 A.] 'Jesus dux qui populum eduxerat de Ægypto, Jesus dux qui interpretatur Salvator, Mose mortuo et sepulto in terra Moab, hoc est, Lege mortua, in Evangelium cupit inducere populum suum.' *S. Hieron. in Psal.* lxxxvi.*

* [This is not a work of Jerom. v. Op. vol. vii. Append. p. 230.]

covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for without Jesus[39], *in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and* [Col. ii. 3.] *knowledge*, there is no looking into the secrets of heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Josuah; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their successor. *For at that time the Lord said unto Josuah, Make thee* Josh. v. 2. *sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time.* Which speaketh Jesus to be the true circumciser[40], the author of another circumcision than that of the flesh commanded by the Law, even *the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and* Rom. ii. 29. *not in the letter;* that which *is made without hands, in putting off* Col. ii. 11. *the body of the sins of the flesh*, which is therefore called *the circumcision of Christ.*

Thus if we look upon Josuah as the *minister of Moses*, he is Exod. xxiv. 13. even in that a type of Christ, the *minister of the circumcision for* Josh. i. 1. *the truth of God.* If we look on him as the successor of Moses, Rom. xv. 8. in that he representeth Jesus, inasmuch as *the Law was given* John i. 17. *by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* If we look on him as now Judge and Ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of Jordan[41], where Christ is baptized and enters upon the public exercise of his prophetical office. He chooseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our Jesus thence began to choose his twelve Apostles[42], those foundation-stones in the Church of God, whose names are in the *twelve foundations* of the wall of *the holy* Rev. xxi. *city, the new Jerusalem.* It hath been observed[43], that the 14.

39 'Moyses—in nubem intravit, ut operta et occulta cognosceret, adhærente sibi socio Jesu, quia nemo sine vero Jesu potest incerta sapientiæ, et occulta comprehendere. Et ideo in specie Jesu Nave veri Salvatoris significabatur ei adspiratura præsentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui Legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret.' *S. Ambros. in Psal.* xlvii. [§. 21. vol. i. p. 944 A.]

40 'Non enim propheta sic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; sed ad Jesum: ut ostenderet quod non de se loqueretur, sed de Christo, ad quem tunc Deus loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Jesus.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 17. [p. 288.]

41 Τύπον δὲ ἔφερεν αὐτοῦ ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦς κατὰ πολλά. ἀρξάμενος γὰρ ἄρχειν τοῦ λαοῦ ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς βαπτισθεὶς ἤρξατο εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. *S. Cyril. Catech.* 10. [§. 11. p. 142 C.]

42 St. Cyril addeth, that he divided the land by twelve men; Δώδεκα δὲ διαιροῦντας τὴν κληρονομίαν καθίστησιν ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ υἱός· καὶ δώδεκα τοὺς Ἀποστόλους κήρυκας τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀποστέλλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. *Ibid.*

43 By the same St. Cyril; Πιστεύσασαν Ῥαὰβ τὴν πόρνην ἔσωσεν ὁ τυπικός· ὁ δὲ ἀληθής φησιν, Ἰδοὺ, οἱ τελῶναι καὶ

saving Rahab the harlot alive, foretold what Jesus once should speak to the Jews, *Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. He said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day:* which great miracle was not only wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also signify[44] that in the latter days, towards the setting of the sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkness, *the Sun of Righteousness should arise with healing in his wings:* and, giving a check to the approaching night, become *the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*

Matt. xxi. 31, Josh. x. 12, 13. Mal. iv. 2. John i. 9.

But to pass by more particulars, Josuah smote the Amalekites, and subdued the Canaanites; by the first making way to enter the land, by the second giving possession of it. And Jesus our *Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world,* in a spiritual manner goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to heaven; destroying the last enemy, death, so giving us possession of eternal life. Thus[45] do we believe the man called Jesus to have fulfilled, in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world; *whom God hath raised up, an horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant David, that we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.*

Acts v. 31. John xviii. 36. Luke i. 69, 71.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article is not

αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ibid.

44 'Stetit [Sol,] quia in Jesu et typum futuri agnoscebat et nomen. Neque enim in sua virtute Jesus Nave, sed Christi mysterio cœlestibus luminibus imperabat. Designabatur enim Dei filium in hoc seculum esse venturum, qui mundani luminis concidentis, et jam vergentis in tenebras, virtute divina differret occasum, lucem redderet, inveheret claritatem.' *S. Ambros. Apolog. David. poster. cap.* 4. §. 24. [vol. i. p. 714 D.] Ille imperavit soli ut staret, et stetit; et istius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabat, sed Dominus efficiebat.' *S. Hieron. in Psal.* lxxvi.*

45 Τί λέγει πάλιν Μωσῆς τῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ τοῦ Ναυῆ υἱῷ, ἐπιθεὶς αὐτῷ τοῦτο ὄνομα ὄντι προφήτῃ; ἵνα μόνον ἀκούσῃ πᾶς λαὸς, ὅτι πάντα ὁ πατὴρ φανεροῖ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ [αὐτοῦ] Ἰησοῦ. [ἔκραζε Μωσῆς] τῷ υἱῷ Ναυῆ· καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τοῦτο ὄνομα ὁπότε ἔπεμψε κατάσκοπον τῆς γῆς· [καὶ ἔλεγε] Λάβε βιβλίον εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ γράψον ἃ λέγει Κύριος· Ὅτι ἐκ βιζῶν ἐκκόψει πάντα τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἀμαλὴκ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ [Ἰησοῦς] ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. ἴδε πάλιν Ἰησοῦς οὐχ ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου [Ναυῆ,] ἀλλ' ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τύπῳ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς. *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 12. [Cotel. i. p. 40.]

* [This is not a work of Jerom. v. Op. vol. vii. Append. p. 197.]

only certain, but evident: because there is no end of faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be saved, and no way to be saved by him but by believing in him. For *this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he in him.* From him then, and from him alone, must we expect salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely there is nothing in ourselves which can effect it, or deserve it for us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us. For *there is* but *one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* It is only the *beloved Son in whom* God *is well pleased,* he is *clothed with a vesture dipt in blood:* he hath *trod the wine-press alone. We like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. By him God hath reconciled all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.* By him alone is our salvation wrought: for his sake then only can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

1 John iii. 23, 24. 1 Tim. ii. 5. [Matt. iii. 17.] [Rev. xix. 13] [Isa. lxiii. 3.] Isa. liii. 6. Col. i. 20.

Secondly, this belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoice in the name of Jesus, as that in which all our happiness is involved. At his nativity an Angel from heaven thus taught the shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed incarnation; *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* And what the Angel delivered at present, that the Prophet Isaiah, that old Evangelist, foretold at distance. When *the people which walked in darkness* should *see a great light;* when *unto us a child* should be *born, unto us a son* should be *given;* then should *they joy before God according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoice when they*
78 *divide the spoil.* When God shall *come with recompense,* when *he shall come and save us;* then *the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Sion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads.*

Luke ii. 10, 11. Isa. ix. 2, 6, 3. Isa. xxxv. 4, 10.

Thirdly, the belief in Jesus ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, engaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so far as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equal share of affection with him. *He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me,* saith our Saviour; so forbidding all prelation of any natural affec-

Matt. x. 37

tion, because our spiritual union is far beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love only debarred us, but any equal pretension is as much forbidden. *If any man come to me,* saith the same Christ, *and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.* Is it not this Jesus, in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expressible by the pen of man? *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.* Is it not he who shewed his own love to us far beyond all possibility of parallel? for *greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends;* but *while we were yet sinners,* that is, enemies, *Christ died for us,* and so became our *Jesus.* Shall thus the Father shew his love in his Son? shall thus the Son shew his love in himself? and shall we no way study a requital? or is there any proper return of love but love? The voice of the Church, in the language of Solomon, is, *My love:* nor was that only the expression of a spouse, but of Ignatius [46], a man, after the Apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot choose but conclude with St. Paul, *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maran-atha.*

Luke xiv. 26.
John iii. 16.
John xv. 13.
Rom. v. 8.
Cant. ii. 7: iii. 5: viii. 4.
1 Cor. xvi. 22.

Lastly, the confession of faith in Jesus is necessary to breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, and an absolute obedience to him, that we may be raised to the true temper of St. Paul, who *counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord, for whom he suffered the loss of all things, and accounted them but dung, that he might win Christ.* Nor can we pretend to any true love of Jesus, except we be sensible of the readiness of our obedience to him: as knowing what language he used to his disciples, *If ye love me, keep my commandments;* and what the Apostle of his bosom spake, *This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.* His own disciples once marvelled, and said, *What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?* How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him, whom the senseless creatures, the winds and the sea, obeyed? Was the name of Jesus at first sufficient to cast out devils, and shall man be more refractory than they? Shall the *exorcist say to the*

Phil. iii. 8.
John xiv. 15.
1 John v. 3.
Matt. viii. 27.
Mark ix. 38.
Luke ix. 49.
Acts xix. 13.

[46] Ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται.

evil spirit, I adjure thee by the name of Jesus, and the Devil give place? Shall an Apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name, which signifieth nothing unto them? for *he took not on him the nature of angels,* and so is not their Saviour; and can we deny obedience unto him, who *took on him the seed of Abraham, and became obedient unto death,* Heb. ii. 16. *even the death of the cross,* for us, that he might be raised to full Phil. ii. 8. power and absolute dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For *God* Phil. ii. 9, *hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above* 10. *every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.*

Having thus declared the original of the name Jesus, the
79 means and ways by which he which bare it expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he says, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus:* which may be not unfitly in this manner described. I believe not only that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and profess that I am fully persuaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an Angel was called Jesus, of whom, particularly Josuah, the first of that name, and all the rest of the judges and saviours of Israel, were but types. I believe that Jesus, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the only way for the salvation of their souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the virtue of his blood, obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually confer the same salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those which unfeignedly and steadfastly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beside that which he hath shewn us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person which shall confer it on us but himself. And with this full acknowledgment, *I believe in Jesus.*

And in Jesus Christ.

HAVING thus explained the proper name of our Saviour,

Jesus, we come unto that title of his office usually joined with his name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined, because the Jews [47], who always acknowledged him to be Jesus,
John ix. 22. ever denied him to be Christ, *and agreed together, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.*

For the full explication of this title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the word; secondly, to shew upon what grounds the Jews always expected a Christ or Messias; thirdly, to prove that the Messias promised to the Jews is already come; fourthly, to demonstrate that our Jesus is that Messias; and fifthly, to declare in what that unction, by which Jesus is Christ, doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that *Jesus is Christ.*

For the first, we find in the Scriptures two several names, *Messias* and *Christ*, but both of the same signification; as
John iv. 25. appeareth by the speech of the woman of Samaria, *I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ;* and more plainly by
John i. 41. what Andrew spake unto his brother Simon, *We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. Messias*, in the Hebrew tongue, *Christ* in the Greek [48]. *Messias* [49], the language

47 Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ καταδέχονται τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸ δὲ καὶ Χριστὸν εἶναι τοῦτον, οὐκέτι. *S. Cyril. Catech.* 10. [§. 14. p. 143 D.]

48 Σύγγονε, Μεσσίαν σοφὸν εὕρομεν, ὃς Θεὸς ἀνὴρ
Χριστὸς Ἰουδαίοισιν ἀκούεται Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ. *Nonnus.* [c. i. v. 157.]

49 From משח *unxit*, in the Hebrew משיח *unctus*; in the Syriac משיחא: in the Greek, by changing ש into σσ, by omitting ח a guttural not fit for their pronunciation, and by adding *s*, as their ordinary termination, משיחא is turned into Μεσσίας. That this was the Greek Χριστός, and the Latin *Christus*, is evident; and yet the Latins living at a distance, strangers to the customs of the Jews and the doctrine of the Christians, mistook this name, and called him *Chrestus*, from the Greek Χρηστός*. So Suetonius in the Life of Claudius, *cap.* 25. 'Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.' Which was not only his mistake, but generally the Romans at first, as they named him *Chrestus*, so they called us *Chrestiani.* 'Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est.' *Tertul. adv. Gentes.* [c. iii. p. 4 D.] 'Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 257.] Upon which mistake Justin Martyr justifies the Christians of his time; Ἐπεὶ ὅσον γε ἐκ τοῦ κατηγορουμένου ἡμῶν ὀνόματος, χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν. [Apol. i. 4. p. 45 C.] And again, Χριστιανοί (or rather Χρηστιανοί) γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα· τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον. *Ibid.* It was then the ignorance of the

* [See a Dissertation by Mich. Rossal: also Kortholt, *Pagan. Obtrect.* p. 713.]

of Andrew and the woman of Samaria, who spake in Syriac; *Christ*, the interpretation of St. John, who wrote his Gospel in

Jewish affairs which caused the Romans to name our Saviour *Chrestus*, and the true title is certainly *Christus*. Χριστὸς μὲν, κατὰ τὸ κεχρίσθαι, saith Justin, [Apol. ii. 6. p. 92 D.] Τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄνομα πρῶτον Μωσέα τοῖς χριομένοις ἐπιθεῖναι· says Eusebius, *Dem. Evang. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 172 A.] 'Quoniam Græci veteres χρίεσθαι dicebant *ungi*, quod nunc ἀλείφεσθαι.—ob hanc rationem nos eum *Christum* nuncupamus, id est, *unctum*, qui Hebraice *Messias* dicitur.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 257.] So the Latins generally, *Christus* a *Chrismate:* and without question Χριστός is from κέχρισται. Yet I conceive the first signification of this word among the Greeks hath not been hitherto sufficiently discovered. The first of the ancients in whom I meet with the word Χριστός is Æschylus the Tragedian, and in him I find it had another sense than now we take it in; for in his language that is not χριστόν which is anointed, but that with which it is anointed; so that it signifieth not the subject of unction, but the ointment as diffused in the subject. The place is this in his *Prometheus Vinctus*, *v.* 478.

Οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημ' οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ βρώσιμον
Οὐ χριστὸν, οὐδὲ πιστὸν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων
Χρείᾳ κατεσκέλλοντο————

Prometheus shews himself to be the inventor of the art of Physic, that before him therefore there was no medicine, neither to be taken internally by eating or by drinking, nor externally by way of inunction, as the Scholiast very well expounds it: Οὐκ ἦν οὐδὲν βοήθημα θεραπείας, οὐδὲ διὰ βρώσεως προσφερόμενον (which is οὐδὲ βρώσιμον in Æschylus) οὔτε δι' ἐπιχρίσεως ἔξωθεν, (which is οὐ χριστόν) οὔτε διὰ πόσεως (τοῦτο δὲ δηλοῖ τὸ πιστόν). So Eustathius, Τρεῖς φαρμάκων ἰδέαι παρ' Ὁμήρῳ, ἐπίπαστα, ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ Μενελάου, ᾧπερ ἤπια φάρμακα εἰδὼς πάσσεν ὁ Μαχάων· καὶ χριστὰ οἷον ἰοὺς χρίεσθαι· καὶ πιστὰ κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον, τοῦτ' ἐστι ποτὰ ἢ πότιμα. *Ad* Ἰλ. δ'. As therefore from πίω πίσω, πιστόν, so from χρίω χρίσω, χριστόν. And as πιστόν is not that which receiveth drink, but that drink which is received, not *quod potat*, but *quod potabile est:* so χριστόν is not that which receiveth oil, but that which is received by inunction. So the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, Τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μέν ἐστι καταπλαστὰ, τὰ δὲ χριστὰ, τὰ δὲ ποτά. [In Plutum v. 717.] And the Scholiast of Theocritus, Ἰστέον ὅτι τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μέν εἰσι χριστὰ, ἤγουν, ἅπερ χριόμεθα εἰς θεραπείαν· τὰ δὲ ποτὰ, ἤγουν, ἅπερ πίνομεν· τὰ δὲ ἐπίπαστα, ἤγουν, ἅπερ ἐπιπάττομεν. *Idyll.* ¶ ii. *ver.* 1. So that χριστόν in his judgment is the same with ἔγχριστον in Theocritus:

Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,
Ἤ ταὶ Πιέριδες————

in the same sense with Æschylus did Euripides use χριστὸν φάρμακον *in Hippolyto*, *ver.* 516:

Πότερα δὲ χριστὸν ἢ ποτὸν τὸ φάρμακον;

And not only those ancient Poets, but even the later Orators; as Dion Chrysostomus: Πολὺ γὰρ χεῖρον καὶ διεφθαρμένου σώματος καὶ νοσοῦντος ψυχὴ διεφθαρμένη, μὰ Δί', οὐχ ὑπὸ φαρμάκων χριστῶν ἢ ποτῶν. *Orat.* 78. [p. 662.] and the LXX. have used it in this sense; as when the Hebrew speaks of שמן המשחה *oleum unctionis*, they translate it, τοῦ ἐπικεχυμένου ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἐλαίου τοῦ χριστοῦ, Lev. xxi. 10. and again, verse 12. שמן משחת ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον τὸ χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ. *Oleum unctionis* then is ἔλαιον χριστὸν, which in Exodus xxix. 7. and xxxv. 15. and xl. 7. the same translators, correspondent to the Hebrew phrase, call ἔλαιον χρίσματος, and more frequently ἔλαιον χρίσεως. The place of Sophocles is something doubtful,

Ὅθεν μόλοι πανάμερος
Τᾶς πειθοῦς παγχρίστῳ
Συγκραθεὶς ἐπὶ προφάσει θηρός.
Trach. v. 660.

For though the Scholiast take it in the ordinary sense, Παγχρίστῳ] Λείπει τῷ πέπλῳ ἤγουν τῷ χρισθέντι πέπλῳ συγκεκραμένος καὶ ἁρμοσθεὶς τῇ πειθοῖ τοῦ θηρός· yet both τᾶς πειθοῦς before it, and συγκραθεὶς after, seem to incline to the

the Greek, as the most general language in those days; and the signification of them both is, the *Anointed*. St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles, writing in that language, used the Greek name, which the Latins did retain, calling him constantly, *Christus*; and we in English have retained the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is to 80
be understood not simply according to the action only, but as it involveth the design in the custom of anointing. For in the Law whatsoever was anointed, was thereby set apart, as ordained to some special use or office: and therefore under the notion of unction we must understand that promotion and
Gen. xxviii. 18. ordination. *Jacob poured oil on the top of a pillar*, and that anointing was the consecration of it. Moses anointed the Tabernacle and all the vessels, and this anointing was their
[Lev. iv. 3.] dedication. Hence *the Priest that is anointed* signifieth, in the phrase of Moses, the High Priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his unction. When therefore Jesus is called the *Messias* or *Christ*, and that so long after the anointing oil had ceased, it signified no less than a person set apart by

former sense; and in the next page ἀρτίχριστον is clearly attributed to the ointment:

Τὸ φάρμακον τοῦτ' ἄπυρον, ἀκτῖνός τ' ἀεὶ
Θέρμης ἄθικτον, ἐν μυχοῖς σώζειν ἐμὲ,
Ἕως ἂν ἀρτίχριστον ἁρμόσαιμί που.
Ibid. v. 685.

From whence Deïanira says presently, ἔχρισα μαλλῷ. But though it appear from hence that the first use of the word χριστός among the Greeks was to signify the act or matter used in inunction, not the subject or person anointed; yet in the vulgar acceptation of the LXX. it was most constantly received for the person anointed, of the same validity with χρισθείς or κεχρισμένος, (Suidas χριστὸς, ὁ κεχρισμένος ἐν ἐλαίῳ,) as also with ἠλειμμένος. For though Lactantius in the place forecited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew משיח, 'Unde in quibusdam Græcis scripturis, quæ male de Hebraicis interpretatæ sunt, ἠλειμμένος, [id est, *unguento curatus*,] scriptum invenitur, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλειφέσθαι.' [Lact. de Vera Sap. iv. 7. p. 257.] yet the LXX. have so translated it, Numb. iii. 3. Οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ ἠλειμμένοι. And although Athenæus hath observed, τῶν μύρων τὰ μέν ἐστι χρίσματα, τὰ δὲ ἀλείμματα· [xv. p. 689.] yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no difference, as he himself speaks a little after, Τὸ δὲ χρίσασθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ ἀλείμματι μυρίσασθαι εἴρηκεν. [p. 691.] And Plutarch, *Sympos. lib.* iii. *cap.* 4. [vol. ii. p. 651 E.] Πύθου παρὰ τῶν ἔτι συναναπαυομένων γυναιξὶν ἢ μύρον ἀληλιμμέναις ἢ ἔλαιον· ἀναπίμπλανται γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ χρίσματος ἐν τῷ συγκαθεύδειν. So Hesychius, Ἀλείψαι, ἐλαίῳ χρίσαι· Κεχρισμένα, ἠλειμμένα. Ἀλοιφὴ, χρίσις. *Schol. Hom.* Χρισάμεναι, ἀλειψάμεναι· Ὀδ. ζ'. And Suidas, Ἠληλίμμην, ἐχριόμην. Hence Eustathius, Ἰστέον καὶ ὅτι ἰσοδυναμούντων κατὰ νοῦν τοῦ τε χρίω, καὶ τοῦ ἀλείφω· τὸ μὲν χρίω παρὰ τὸν χροῦν ἐρρήθη ὃς χρίεται, τὸ δὲ ἀλείφω, παρὰ τὸ ἀλέω. Ὀδ. ζ'. So Eusebius, Τρίτῃ τάξει Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι ἐλαίῳ, οὐ τῷ ἐξ ὕλης σωμάτων, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐνθέῳ τῆς ἀγαλλιάσεως ἠλειμμένον παρίστησι. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [p. 13.] Χριστός then in the vulgar sense of the LXX. is a person anointed, and in that sense is our Saviour called Christ.

God, anointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the highest office, of which all those employments under the Law, in the obtaining of which oil was used, were but types and shadows. And this may suffice for the signification of the word.

81 That there was among the Jews an expectation of such a Christ to come, is most evident. The woman of Samaria could speak with confidence, *I know that Messias cometh.* And the unbelieving Jews, who will not acknowledge that he is already come, expect him still. Thus we find *all men musing in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not.* When Jesus taught in the Temple, those which doubted said, *When Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is;* those which believed said, *When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?* Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed in Jesus, they all expected a Christ to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more they believed he was that Messias. *Many of the people said, Of a truth this is the Prophet; others said, This is the Christ.* As soon as John began to baptize, *the Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, Who art thou?* that is, whether he were the Christ or no, as appeareth out of his answer, *And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ.* For as they asked him after, *What then, Art thou Elias? and he said, I am not: Art thou that Prophet? and he answered, No:* so without question their first demand was, Art thou the Christ[50]? and he answered, I am not: from whence it clearly appeareth that there was a general expectation among the Jews of a Messias to come; nor only so, but it was always counted among them an article of their faith, which all were obliged to believe who professed the Law of Moses, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the Law and the Prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our inquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation.

John iv. 25. Luke iii. 15. John vii. 27, 31. Ver. 40, 41. John i. 19. Verse 20. Verse 21. Auctor Sepher Ikkarim, l. iv. c. ult. Maimon. Tract. de Regibus, c. 11.

It is most certain that the Messias was promised by God, both before and under the Law. God said unto Abraham, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called:* and we know that was a promise of a Messias to come, because St. Paul hath taught us, *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, unto*

Gen. xxi. 12. Gal. iii. 16.

50 So Nonnus hath expressed, what in the Evangelist is to be understood;

Μυστιπόλοι δ' ἐρέεινον ὁμήλυδες ὀξέϊ μυθῷ,
Τίς σὺ πέλεις; μὴ Χριστὸς ἔφυς; [c. i. v. 65.]

seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.
Deut. xviii. 18. The Lord said unto Moses, *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.* And St. Peter hath suffi-
Acts iii. 22. ciently satisfied us, that this Prophet promised to Moses, is *Jesus the Christ.* Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him: but yet some of them very obscure; others, though plainer, yet have relation only to the person, not to the notion or the word *Messias.* Whereso-ever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel,
Dan. ix. 26. where Messiah is foretold *to be cut off:* and yet even there the Greek translation hath not the Messiah, but the *Unction.* It may therefore seem something strange, how so universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the Messias should be spread through the Church of the Jews.

But if we consider* that in the space of seventy years of the Babylonish captivity the ordinary Jews had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language before spoken in Judea, and therefore, when the Scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee language, which they had lately learned: as when Ezra the Scribe brought the book of the Law of Moses before the congregation, the Levites are said to have caused the people to
Neh. viii. 8. understand the Law, because *they read in the Book in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.* Which constant interpretation begat at last a Chaldee translation of the Old Testament to be read every sabbath in the synagogues: and that being not exactly made word for word with the Hebrew, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in, together with the text, the general opinion of the learned Jews. By which means it came 82
to pass that not only the doctrine, but the name also, of the Messias was very frequent and familiar with them. Insomuch that even in the Chaldee paraphrase now extant, there is express mention of the Messias in above seventy places, beside that of Daniel. The Jews then informed by the plain words of Daniel[51],

51 Celsus the Epicurean acknowledgeth that both the Jews and Christians did confess that the Prophets did foretell a Saviour of the world. Οἴεται μηδὲν σεμνὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Χριστιανῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ζητήσει· πιστευόντων μὲν ἀμφοτέρων ὅτι ἀπὸ θείου Πνεύματος προεφητεύθη τις ἐπιδημήσων

* [This sentence is incomplete in all the editions. The meaning seems to be, "If we consider, we shall find that in the space &c."]

instructed by a constant interpretation of the Law and the Prophets read in their synagogues every sabbath day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own nation, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, a Messias, or a Christ, to come.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the time in which this promise was to be fulfilled: which we shall demonstrate out of the Scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised Messias is already come. The prediction of Jacob on his death-bed is clear and pregnant; *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be:* but the sceptre is departed from Judah, neither is there one lawgiver left between his feet: therefore Shiloh, that is, the Messias, is already come. That the Jewish government hath totally failed, is not without the greatest folly to be denied: and therefore that Shiloh is already come, except we should deny the truth of divine predictions, must be granted. There then remains nothing to be proved, but that by Shiloh is to be understood the Messias: which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient Jews, and from the description immediately added to the name. For all the old paraphrasts[52] call him expressly the Messias, and the words which follow, *to him shall the gathering of the people be,* speak no less; as giving an explication of his person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name of Shiloh. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto Abraham: *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed:* by which he is decyphered in Isaiah; *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious;* and in Micah, *The*

Gen. xlix. 10.

Gen. xxii. 18.

Isa. xi. 10.

Micah iv. 1.

Σωτὴρ τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Orig. adv. Celsum, lib.* iii. [c. i. vol. i. p. 448 A.] And this Saviour, saith Origen, was to be called κατὰ τὰ Ἰουδαίων πάτρια, Χριστός.

52 For, instead of עד כי יבא שילה Onkelos renders it עד דייתי מלכא משיחא [the word מלכא is not in Onkelos], and Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum, עד זמן די ייתי מלכא משיחא. Beside the Cabalists did generally so interpret it, because יבא שילה according to their computation, make the same number with the letters of משיח. And in the Talmud, *Cod. Sanhedrin,* [§. 11. fol. 98ro. ed. Vindob. 1849,] Rabbi Johanan asking what was the name of the Messias, they of the School of R. Schilo answer, שילה שמו *his name is Shiloh,* according to that which is written, *until Shiloh come.**

* ["It is observed that the Chaldee Paraphrase doth expressly mention the "Messias in above seventy places." Barrow, vol. vi. p. 222.]

mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it. And thus the blessing of Judah is plainly
Gen. xlix. 8. intelligible: *Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy father's children shall bow down before thee.* Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and by virtue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the tribes: the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee. And that you may understand this blessing is not to expire until it make way for a greater, know that this government shall not fail, until there come a son out of your loins, who shall be far greater than yourself: for whereas your dominion reacheth only over your brethren, and so is confined unto the tribes of Israel; his kingdom shall be universal, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Being then this Shiloh is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jews to be the Messias, being God hath promised by Jacob the government of Israel should not fail until Shiloh came; being that government is visibly and undeniably already failed, it followeth inevitably that the Messias is already come.

In the same manner the Prophet Malachy hath given an express signification of the coming of the Messias while the
Mal. iii. 1. Temple stood. *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall* 83
suddenly come to his Temple, even the Messenger of the covenant
Hag. ii. 6, 7, 9. *whom ye delight in*[53]. And Haggai yet more clearly, *Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations; and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts.* It is then most evident from these predictions, that the Messias was to come while the second Temple stood. It is as certain that the second Temple is not now standing. Therefore, except we contradict the veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the Messias is already come. Nothing can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these prophecies concern not the Messias; and yet the ancient Jews confessed they did, and that they do so cannot be denied.

[53] האדון הוא מלך המשיח: Kimchi on the place.

For, first, those titles, *the angel of the covenant, the delight of the Israelites, the desire of all nations,* are certain and known characters of the Christ to come. And secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second Temple should be greater than the glory of the first, without the coming of the Messias to it. For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the Divine glory were in the first Temple, which were wanting to the second: as the Urim and Thummim, by which the High Priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the ark of the covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice; the fire upon the altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consumed the sacrifice; the Divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the king and high priest by anointing with the oil of unction; and, lastly, the Spirit of Prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetical office were indued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the tears dropt from those eyes which had beheld the former, for *many of the Priests and Levites,* Ezra iii. 12. *and chief of the Fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice;* and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this Prophecy, *Who is left among you that saw this house in her* Hag. ii. 3. *first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?* Being then the structure of the second Temple was so far inferior to the first, being all those signs of the Divine glory were wanting in it, with which the former was adorned; the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, than by the coming of him into it, in whom all those signs of the Divine glory were far more eminently contained; and this person alone is the Messias. For he was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea, even of the God of Israel; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle, was revealed; he the true Ark of the Covenant, the only Propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us that we might behold his glory; he who received the Spirit without measure, and

from whose fulness we do all receive. In him were all those signs of the divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first Temple; in him they were all more eminently contained than in those: therefore his coming to the second Temple was, as the sufficient, so the only means by which the glory of it could be greater than the glory of the first. If then the Messias was to come while the second Temple stood, as appeareth by God's prediction and promise; if that Temple many ages since hath ceased to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly were before the destruction of it in greater glory than ever the former was; if no such glory could accrue unto it 84
but by the coming of the Messias; then is that Messias already come.

Having thus demonstrated out of the promises given to the Jews, that the Messias who was so promised unto them must be already come, because those events which were foretold to follow his coming are already past; we shall proceed unto the next particular, and prove that the man Jesus, in whom we believe, is that Messias who was promised. First, it is acknowledged both by the Jew and Gentile, that this Jesus was born in Judea, and lived and died there, before the commonwealth of Israel was dispersed, before the second Temple was destroyed, that is, at the very time when the Prophets foretold the Messias should come. And there was no other beside him, that did with any show of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as the Messias. Therefore we must confess he was, and only he could be, the Christ.

Secondly, all other prophecies belonging to the Messias were fulfilled in Jesus, whether we look upon the family, the place, or the manner of his birth; neither were they ever fulfilled in any person beside him: he then is, and no other can be, the Messias. That he was to come out of the tribe of Judah and family of David, is everywhere manifest. The Jews[54], which mention Messias as a Son of Joseph or of Ephraim, do not deny, but rather dignify, the Son of David or of Judah, whom they confess

54 The Jews have invented a double Messias: to one they attribute all those places which mention his low estate and sufferings: to the other, such as speak of his power and glory. The one they style משיח בן יוסף the other משיח בן דוד. The Son of Joseph they name also the Son of Ephraim, and the Son of David the Son of Judah; as the Targum, Cant. iv. 5. *Thy two breasts are like two young roes;* תרין פריקין משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים: *Two are thy Redeemers, Messias the Son of David, and Messias the Son of Ephraim.*

to be the greater Christ. *There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse*[55], *and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him,* saith the Prophet Isaiah. And again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious.* Now who was it but Jesus of whom the elders spake, *Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David?* Who but he said, *I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star?* The Jews did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour, *How say the Scribes that Christ is the Son of David? What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David;* and that of the people, amazed at the seeing of the blind, and speaking of the dumb, *Is not this the Son of David?* the blind cried out unto him, *Jesus thou Son of David, have mercy on us;* and the multitude cried, *Hosanna to the Son of David.* The genealogy of Jesus shews his family: the first words of the Gospel are, *The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David.* The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of his lineage; *for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah.*

Isa. xi. 1. Verse 10. Rev. v. 5. Rev. xxii. 16. Mark xii. 35. Matt. xxii. 42. Matt. xii. 23. Matt. xx. 31. Matt. xxi. 9. Matt. i. 1. Heb. vii. 14.

Beside, if we look upon the place where the Messias was to be born, we shall find that Jesus by a particular act of providence was born there. *When* Herod *gathered all the chief Priests and Scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea.* The people doubted whether Jesus was the Christ, because they thought he had been born in Galilee, where Joseph and Mary lived: wherefore they said, *Shall Christ come out of Galilee; hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?* That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the Scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the Jews, and still preserved in the Chaldee paraphrase[56]: *For thus it is written in the Prophet, And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of*

Matt. ii. 4, 5. John vii. 41, 42. Matt. ii. 5, 6.

55 Which the Chaldee Paraphrase thus translates, ויפוק מלכא מבנוהי דישי ומשיחא מבני בנוהי יתרבי: *A King shall come of the sons of Jesse, and the Messias out of his sons' sons.* So Rabbi Solomon and Kimchi.

56 Which expressly translateth it thus: מינך קדמי יפוק משיחא למהוי עביד שולטן על ישראל: *Out of thee shall come before me the Messias, that he may exercise domination in Israel.* So Rabbi Solomon, ממך יבא לי משיח בן דוד. So Kimchi and Abarbanel, הוא המלך המשיח.

Judah, for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my 85
people Israel. This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, when by the providence of God it was so ordered that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own city. Whereupon Joseph and Mary his espoused wife left Nazareth of Galilee, their habitation, and went unto Bethlehem of Judea,
Luke ii. 4. the city of David, there to be taxed, *because they were of the house and lineage of David.* And while they were there, as the days of the Virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfilled; for there she brought forth her first-born Son;
Verse 11. and so *unto us was born that day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.*

But if we add unto the family and place, the manner of his birth, also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The Prophet Isaiah spake thus unto the house of
Isa. vii. 14. David; *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel.* What nativity could be more congruous to the greatness of a Messias than that of a Virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him than that of Immanuel, *God*
Isa. viii. 8. *with us*, whose land Judea is said to be? The Immanuel then thus born of a Virgin was without question the true Messias. And we know Jesus was thus born of the blessed Virgin Mary,
Matt. i. 22. *that it might be fulfilled which was* thus *spoken of the Lord by the Prophet.* Wherefore being all the prophecies concerning the family, place, and manner of the birth of the Messias were fulfilled in Jesus, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other, it is again from hence apparent that this Jesus is the Christ.

Thirdly, he which taught what the Messias was to teach, did what the Messias was to do, suffered what the Messias was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a Messias could obtain, must be acknowledged of necessity to be the true Messias. But all this is manifestly true of Jesus; therefore we must confess he is the Christ. For first, it cannot be denied but the Messias was promised as a Prophet and Teacher of the people.
Deut. xviii. 18. So God promised him to Moses; *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.* So Isaiah, Ezekiel and Hoseah have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have farther occasion to shew. And not only so, but as a greater Prophet,

and more perfect Doctor, than ever any was which preceded him, more universal than they all. *I have put my Spirit upon him,* saith God: *he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, and the isles shall wait for his law.* Now it is as evident that Jesus of Nazareth was the most perfect Prophet, the Prince and Lord of all the prophets, doctors, and pastors, which either preceded or succeeded him. For he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority; not like Moses and the Prophets, saying, *Thus saith the Lord,* but *I say unto you;* nor like the interpreters of Moses, for *he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes:* with the greatest perspicuity, not, as those before him, under types and shadows, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine is frequently called *Light;* with the greatest universality, as preaching that Gospel which is to unite all the nations of the earth into one Church, that there might be one Shepherd and one flock. Whatsoever then that great Prophet the Messias was to teach, that Jesus taught; and whatsoever works he was to do, those Jesus did.

Isa. xlii. 1, 4. 'Αρχιποίμην, 1 Pet. v. 4. ὁ ποιμὴν τῶν προβάτων ὁ μέγας, Heb. xiii. 20. ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν, 1 Pet. ii. 25. Matt. v. often. Matt. vii. 29.

When John the Baptist had heard the *works of Christ, he sent two of his Disciples* with this message to him, *Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?* And Jesus returned this answer unto him, shewing the ground of that message, *the works of Christ,* was a sufficient resolution of the question sent; *Go and* 86 *shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up.* And as Jesus alleged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the Messias; so did those Jews acknowledge it, who said, *When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man doth?* And Nicodemus, a ruler among them, confessed little less: *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.* Great and many were the miracles which Moses and the rest of the Prophets wrought for the ratification of the Law, and the demonstration of God's constant presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many several persons, in the space of above three thousand years, are far short of those which this one Jesus did perform within the compass of three years. The ambitious diligence of the Jews hath reckoned up

Matt. xi. 2, 3. Verses 4, 5. John vii. 31. John iii. 2.

seventy-six miracles for Moses, and seventy-four for all the rest of the Prophets: and supposing that they were so many, (though indeed they were not,) how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable, if compared with all which he wrought! when St. John testifieth with as great certainty of truth as height of hyperbole, that

John xxi. 25. *there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one,* he *supposed that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.* Nor did our Saviour excel all others in the number of his miracles only, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, received it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas

Col. ii. 9. this power must of necessity be in Jesus, in whom *dwelt all the*

John v. 26. *fulness of the Godhead bodily,* and to whom the Father had *given to have life in himself.* This he sufficiently shewed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise: by working without a word or any

Mark v. 25, 29. intervenient sign; as when the woman which *had an issue of blood twelve years touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up* by the virtue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lest this example

Matt. xiv. 34, 36. Luke vi. 17, 19. should be single, we find that *the men of* Gennesaret, *the people out of all Judea and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon,* even *the whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all.* Once indeed Christ seemeth to have prayed, before he raised Lazarus from the

John xi. 42. grave, but even that was done *because of the people which stood by:* not that he had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterward to raise himself; but *that they might believe the Father had sent him.* The immanency and inherency of this power in Jesus is evident in this, that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did confer it

Luke x. 19. upon his Disciples: *Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy.* Upon

Matt. x. 8. the Apostles: *Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give.* Upon the first

Mark xvi. 17. John xiv. 12. believers: *These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils. He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do.*

He then which did more actions divine and powerful than Moses and all the Prophets ever did, he which performed them in a manner far more divine than that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the Messias, foretold by them, should do.

Nor hath our Jesus only done, but suffered, all which the Messias was to suffer. For we must not with the Jews deny a suffering Christ, or fondly of our own invention make a double
87 Messias, one to suffer, and another to reign. It is clear enough by the Prophet Isaias what his condition was to be, whom he calls the *Servant* of God: and the later Jews cannot deny but their fathers constantly understood that place of the Messias[57]. Isa. lii. 13.

[57] For first, instead of those words, *Behold, my servant shall deal prudently,* the Targum hath it plainly הא יצלח עבדי משיחא: *Behold, my servant the Messias shall prosper.* And Solomon Jarchi on the place, רבותינו מוקמי לה במשיח *Our Rabbins understand this of the Messias.* And the reason which he renders of their interpretation is very observable. For they say, says he, that the Messias is stricken, as it is written, *He took our infirmities, and bare our griefs;* which are the words of the 4th verse of the 53rd chapter. From whence we may perceive how the ancient Jews did join the latter part of the 52d chapter with the 53rd, and expound them of the same person. Besides he cites a certain *Midrash* or Gloss, which attributes the same verse to the Messias, and that is to be found in *Bereshit Rabba* upon Gen. xxviii. 10, where, falling upon that place in Zech. iv. 7, *What art thou, O great mountain, before Zerubbabel?* he answers, הר הגדול זה משיח *That great mountain is the Messias.* Then asking again, *Why doth he call the Messias a great mountain?* he gives this answer, שהוא גדול מן האבות שנ"הנה ישכיל עבדי זה משיח: *Because he is greater than the fathers, as it is written, Behold, my servant shall understand, that is, the Messias:* which are the words of the verse before cited. And the same *Bereshit Rabba,* upon Gen. xxiv. 67, saith, Messias the King was in the generation of the wicked; that he gave himself to seek for mercies for Israel, and to fasting and humbling himself for them, as it is written; and so produceth the words of Isa. liii. 5. From whence it appears again, that the author thereof interpreted both the chapters of the same Messias. And farther it is observable, that the *Midrash* upon Ruth ii. 14 expounds the same verse in the same manner. And Rabbi Moses Alshech speaks yet more fully of the consent of the ancient Jewish Doctors upon this place, הנה רו"ל פה אחד קיימו וקבלו כי על מלך המשיח ידבר: *Behold our doctors of happy memory conclude with one mouth, as they have received from their ancestors, that this is spoken of the Messias.* From hence it appears, that it was originally the general sense of the Jews, that all that piece of Isaiah is a description of the Messias, and consequently that the Apostles cannot be blamed by them now for applying it to Christ; and that the modern Jews may well be suspected to frame their contrary expositions out of a wilful opposition to Christianity. [This note is a condensation of two passages in Raymund Martin's Pugio Fidei, the first part being taken from p. 311, the latter beginning with the words "And the same Bereshit Rabba" from p. 671. But Martin does not say "Solomon Jarchi on this place," but simply Item glossa R. Sal. Jarchi. In his commentary on the place R. Solomon gives an explanation still in favour among the Jews: הנה באחרית הימים יצליח עבדי יעקב צדיקים שבו but as this reading is evidently defective, I have examined a very old MS. in the Bodleian [Opp. 34. f. 202], and find הנה באחרית הימים ישכיל יעקב ויצליח צדקים שבהם The

Now the sufferings of Christ spoken of by the Prophet may be reduced to two parts: one in respect of contempt, by which he was despised of men; the other in respect of his death, and all those indignities and pains which preceded and led unto it. For the first, the Prophet hath punctually described his con-
Isa. liii. 2, 3. dition, saying, *He hath no form or comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men.* He seems to describe a personage no way amiable, an aspect indeed rather uncomely[58]; and so the most ancient writers[59] have interpreted Isaias, and con-

latter variant was also found by Mr. Rose in a MS. preserved in the library of St. John's Coll. Cambridge. R. Solomon's gloss therefore is, that by the servant of Jehovah is meant either the Jewish nation collectively, or at least the righteous members of it. I have in vain examined such other portions of the voluminous writings of R. Solomon as seemed likely to contain the extract in question, but have found only one place in which he even allows that the Messiah is prophesied of in Is. liii, namely in his Commentary on the Targum, Tract. Sanhedrin, fol. 98ro, where, referring to Is. liii. 4, he says, איהו משיח, This is the Messiah. R.P.S.]

58 The first לא תאר לו seems to signify no less, as being from the root תאר, which signifieth *to form, figure, fashion,* or *delineate:* from whence the noun attributed to any person signifieth the feature, complexion, shape, or composition of the body; as Rachel was יפת תאר, *forma pulchra,* Gen. xxix. 17; and so Joseph יפה תאר Gen. xxxix. 6. So Abigail and Esther, and in general, Deut. xxi. 11. with an addition of *fair* added to תאר, whereas David is called, without such addition, איש תאר, but with the full signification, ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τῷ εἴδει. In Judges viii. 18, אחד כתאר בני המלך Εἷς ὁμοίωμα υἱοῦ βασιλέως, so the Roman; but the Aldus and Complutensian better, Ὡς εἶδος υἱῶν βασιλέως, according to that verse of Euripides cited by Athenæus and Porphyrius,

Πρῶτον μὲν εἶδος ἄξιον τυραννίδος.

The Messias was to be a king, whose external form and personage spake no such majesty.

59 As Justin Martyr, Οἱ μὲν εἰρηνται εἰς τὴν πρώτην παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἄτιμος, καὶ ἀειδὴς, καὶ θνητὸς φανήσεσθαι κεκηρυγμένος ἐστίν. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 14. [p. 115 B.] Ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ νομιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱοῦ ὑπάρχειν, καὶ ἀειδοῦς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκήρυσσον, φαινομένου. *Ibid.* §. 88. [p. 186 C.] Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄρχοντες ἑώρων ἀειδῆ καὶ ἄτιμον τὸ εἶδος καὶ ἄδοξον ἔχοντα αὐτὸν, οὐ γνωρίζοντες αὐτὸν, ἐπυνθάνοντο, Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; *Ibid.* §. 36. [p. 134 B.] And Clemens Alexandrinus, Τὸν δὲ κύριον αὐτὸν τὴν ὄψιν αἰσχρὸν γεγονέναι διὰ Ἡσαΐου τὸ Πνεῦμα μαρτυρεῖ, καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, &c. *Pæd.* iii. *cap.* 1. [vol. i. p. 252.] Ὅπου γε καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐν σαρκὶ μὲν ἀειδὴς διελήλυθε καὶ ἄμορφος. *Strom.* 3. [c. 17. vol. i. p. 559.] And Celsus, impiously arguing against the descent of the Holy Ghost upon our Saviour, says, It is impossible that any body, in which something of the Divinity were, should not differ from others; Τοῦτο δὲ (the body of Christ) οὐδὲν ἄλλου διέφερεν, ἀλλ', ὥς φασι, μικρὸν, καὶ δυσειδὲς, καὶ ἀγεννὲς ἦν. [*Orig. cont. Cels.* lib. vi. §. 75. p. 689 A.] This which Celsus by his ὥς φασι seems to take from the common report of Christians in his age, Origen will have him take it out of Isaiah, and upon that acknowledgeth τὸ δυσειδές, but the other two, μικρόν and ἀγεννές, he denies. Ὁμολογουμένως τοίνυν γέγραπται τὰ περὶ τοῦ δυσειδὲς γεγονέναι τὸ Ἰησοῦ σῶμα, οὐ μὴν, ὡς ἐκτέθειται, καὶ ἀγεννές· οὐδὲ σαφῶς δηλοῦται ὅτι μικρὸν ἦν· ἔχει δὲ ἡ λέξις οὕτω παρὰ τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ ἀναγεγραμμένη, &c. and then cites this place, and so returns it as an answer to the argument of Celsus, that because he was foretold to be as he was, he must be the Son of God. Με-

fessed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what
88 the aspect of his outward appearance was, because the Scriptures are silent, we cannot now know: and it is enough that we are assured the state and condition of his life was in the eye of the Jews without honour and inglorious. For though, *being in the* Phil. ii. 6.
form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: yet *he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of*

γάλη κατασκευή ἐστι τοῦ τὸν ἄμορφον εἶναι δοκοῦντα Ἰησοῦν, υἱὸν εἶναι Θεοῦ, τὸ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ πεπροφητεῦσθαι καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ. [Ibid. p. 690 B.] In the same sense did St. Cyril take these words of the Prophet; who, speaking of that place of the Psalmist, *Speciosus forma præ filiis hominum,* observes this must be understood of his Divinity. Κένωσις γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ταπείνωσις τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας ὅλον ἐστὶ τὸ μυστήριον· γράφει δήπου καὶ ὁ προφήτης Ἡσαΐας περὶ αὐτοῦ,—Οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, οὐδὲ κάλλος, &c. And again, Ἐν εἴδει πέφηνεν ὁ υἱὸς τῷ λίαν ἀκαλλεστάτῳ. Tertullian speaks plainly as to the prophecy, and too freely in his way of expression: 'Sed carnis terrenæ non mira conditio, ipsa erat quæ cætera ejus miranda faciebat, cum dicerent, *Unde huic doctrina et signa ista?*—Adeo nec humanæ honestatis corpus fuit, nedum cœlestis claritatis. Tacentibus apud nos quoque prophetis (Isa. liii. 2.) de ignobili aspectu ejus, ipsæ passiones, ipsæque contumeliæ loquuntur. Passiones quidem, humanam carnem; contumeliæ vero, inhonestam. An ausus esset aliquis ungue summo perstringere corpus novum, sputaminibus contaminare faciem nisi merentem?' *De Carne Christi, cap.* 9. [p. 316 C.] And that we may be sure he pointed at that place in Isaiah, he says, that Christ was 'ne aspectu quidem honestus: *Annunciavimus enim,* inquit, *de illo, sicut puerulus, sicut radix in terra sitienti, et non erat ei species neque gloria.*' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 17. [p. 406 D.] *et adv. Jud. cap.* 14. [p. 200 D.] This humility of Christ, in taking upon him the nature of man without the ordinary ornaments of man, at first acknowledged, was afterwards denied, as appears by St. Jerom, on the 56th of Isaiah; [Is. lii. 14. vol. iv. p. 612 E.] 'Inglorius erit inter homines aspectus ejus, non quo formæ significat fœditatem, sed quo in humilitate veneritet paupertate.' And Epist. 140. [Ep. lxv. §. 8. vol. i. p. 377 A.] 'Absque passionibus crucis, universis pulchrior est. Virgo de virgine, qui non ex voluntate Dei, sed ex Deo natus est. Nisi enim habuisset et in vultu quiddam oculisque sidereum, nunquam eum statim secuti fuissent Apostoli, nec qui ad comprehendendum eum venerant corruissent.' So St. Chrysostom interprets the words of Isaiah of his Divinity, or Humility, or his Passion; but those of the Psalmist, of his native corporal beauty. Οὐδὲ γὰρ θαυματουργῶν ἦν θαυμαστὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φαινόμενος ἁπλῶς πολλῆς ἔγεμε χάριτος· καὶ τοῦτο ὁ προφήτης δηλῶν ἔλεγεν, Ὡραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Homil.* 28. *in Matt.* [al. 27. §. 2. vol. vii. p. 328 A.] Afterwards they began to magnify the external beauty of his body, and confined themselves to one kind of picture or portraiture, with a zealous pretence of a likeness not to be denied, which 800 years since was known by none, every several country having a several image. Whence came that argument of the Iconoclastæ by way of *Quære,* which of those images was the true? Πότερον ἡ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις, ἢ ἥνπερ Ἰνδοὶ γράφουσιν, ἢ ἡ παρ' Ἕλλησιν, ἢ ἡ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις; οὐχ ὅμοιαι ἀλλήλαις αὐταί. *Phot. Epist.* 64. [p. 115.] And well might none of these be like another, when every nation painted our Saviour in the nearest similitude to the people of their own country. Ἕλληνες μὲν αὐτοῖς ὅμοιον ἐπὶ γῆς φανῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν νομίζουσι. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μᾶλλον ἑαυτοῖς ἐοικότα· Ἰνδοὶ δὲ πάλιν μορφῇ τῇ αὐτῶν, καὶ Αἰθίοπες δῆλον ὡς ἑαυτοῖς. *Idem, ibid.* [p. 117.] And the difference of opinions in this kind is sufficiently apparent out of those words in Suidas, Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ἀκριβέστατοι τῶν ἱστορικῶν, ὡς τὸ οὖλον καὶ ὀλιγότριχον οἰκειότερόν ἐστι γράφειν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

a servant. For thirty years he lived with his mother Mary, and
Luke ii. 51. Joseph his reputed father, of a mean profession, *and was subject unto them.* When he left his mother's house, and entered on his prophetical office, he passed from place to place, sometimes received into a house, other times lodging in the fields: for
Matt. viii. 20. while the *foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, the Son of man had not where to lay his head.* From this low estate of life and condition, seemingly inglorious, arose in the Jews a
Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. neglect of his works, and contempt of his doctrine. *Is not this the Carpenter's son?* nay, farther, *Is not this the Carpenter*[60], *the son of Mary? And they were offended at him.* Thus was it
Isa. liii. 3. fulfilled in him, *he was despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed him not.*

This contempt of his personage, condition, doctrine, and works, was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution, to a cruel and ignominious death. All which if we look upon in the gross, we must acknowledge it fulfilled in him to the highest
Isa. liii. 3. degree imaginable, that he was *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.* But if we compare the particular predictions with the historical passages of his sufferings; if we join the Prophets and Evangelists together, it will most manifestly appear the Messias was to suffer nothing which Christ hath not suffered.
Zech. xi. 12. If Zachary say, *they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver;* St. Matthew will shew that Judas sold Jesus at the same rate;
Matt. xxvi. 15. Isa. liii. 5. Zech. xii. 10. for the chief Priests *covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver.* If Isaiah say that *he was wounded,* if Zachary, *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced,* if the Prophet David yet more particularly, *they pierced my hands and my feet;* the Evangelist will
Ps. xxii. 16. John xx. 25. shew how he was fastened to the cross, and Jesus himself *the print of the nails.* If the Psalmist tells us, they should *laugh him to scorn,* and *shake their head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him;* St. Matthew will describe the same action, and the same
Psal. xxii. 7, 8. Matt. xxvii. 39, 43. expression; for *they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will*
Ps. xxii. 1. *have him; for he said, I am the Son of God.* Let David say, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* and the Son of David
Matt. xxvii. 46. will shew in whose person the father spake it, *Eli, Eli, lama*

60 Καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου· ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὢν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά. *Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 88. [p. 186 D.]

sabachthani. Let Isaiah foretell, *he was numbered with the trans-* Isa. liii. 12.
gressors; and you shall find him crucified between *two thieves,* Mark xv.
the one on his right hand, and the other on his left. Read in the 27.
Psalmist, *In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink;* and you Ps. lxix. 21.
shall find in the Evangelist, *Jesus, that the Scripture might be* John xix.
fulfilled, said, I thirst: and they took a sponge, and filled it with 28. Matt. xxvii.
vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. Read farther 48.
yet, *They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my* Psal. xxii.
vesture; and, to fulfil the prediction, the soldiers shall make 18.
good the distinction, *who took his garments, and made four parts,* John xix.
to every soldier a part, and also his coat: now the coat was without 23, 24.
seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it whose it shall be.

89 Lastly, let the Prophets teach us, that he shall be *brought like a* Isa. liii.
lamb to the slaughter, and be *cut off out of the land of the living;* 7, 8.
all the Evangelists will declare how like a lamb he suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that he was cut off: and now may we well conclude, *thus it is written, and thus it behoved* the Luke xxiv.
Christ to suffer; and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he 46.
suffered.

Neither only in his passion, but after his death all things were fulfilled in Jesus which were prophesied concerning the Messias. *He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death,* Isa. liii. 9.
saith the Prophet of the Christ to come: and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was Jesus, but laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor. *After* Hos. vi. 2.
two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, saith Hoseah of the people of Israel; in whose language they were the type of Christ: and the third day Jesus rose from the Hos. xi. 1.
dead. *The Lord said unto my Lord,* saith David, *Sit thou at my* Psal. cx. 1.
right hand. Now *David is not ascended into the heavens,* and con- Acts ii. 34.
sequently cannot be set at the right hand of God; but Jesus is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God: and so *all the house of Israel* might *know assuredly, that God hath* Verse 36.
made that same Jesus, whom they *crucified, both Lord and Christ.* For he, who taught whatsoever the Messias, promised by God, foretold by the Prophets, expected by the people of God, was to teach; he who did all which that Messias was by virtue of that office to do; he which suffered all those pains and indignities which that Messias was to suffer; he to whom all things happened after his death, the period of his sufferings, which were

according to the divine predictions to come to pass; he, I say, must infallibly be the true Messias. But Jesus alone taught, did, suffered, and obtained all these things, as we have shewed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our Jesus is the Christ.

Fourthly, if it were the proper note and character of the Messias, that all nations should come in to serve him; if the doctrine of Jesus hath been preached and received in all parts of the world, according to that character so long before delivered; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine revealed by Jesus should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been divine; then must this Jesus be the Messias: and when we have proved these three particulars, we may safely conclude he is the Christ.

That all nations were to come in to the Messias, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. God
Ps. ii. 8. speaks to him thus, as to his Son; *Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* It was one greater than Solomon,
Ps. lxxii. 11. of whom these words were spoken, *All kings shall fall down*
Isa. ii. 2. *before him, all nations shall serve him. It shall come to pass in the last days,* saith Isaiah, *that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted*
Isa. xi. 10. *above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it.* And again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek.* And in general all the prophets were but instruments to deliver the same mes-
Mal. i. 11. sage, which Malachy concludes, from God: *From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.* Now being the bounds of Judea were settled, being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming of the Messias, being this was it which the Jews so much opposed, as loath to part from their ancient and peculiar privilege; he which actually wrought this work must certainly be the Messias: and that Jesus did it, is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached 90
Matt. xv. 24. by Jesus, cannot be denied. For although he were *not sent but*

unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel; although of those many Israelites which believed on him while he lived, very few were left immediately after his death: yet when the Apostles had received their commission from him to *go teach all nations,* and were *endued with power from on high,* by the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of *three thousand souls;* immediately after we find *the number of the men,* beside women, *was about five thousand;* and still *believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.* Upon the persecution at Jerusalem, they went through the *regions of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria,* and so the Gospel spread; insomuch that St. James the bishop of Jerusalem spake thus unto St. Paul, *Thou seest, brother, how many thousands* (or rather, *how many myriads,* that is, ten thousands) *of the Jews there are which believe.* Beside, how great was the number of the believing Jews, strangers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, and the rest of the Roman provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. James, and St. John. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the Law; who had before abandoned their old idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confess the Deity which the Jews did worship to be that only true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole Law. Now the Apostles preaching the same God with Moses whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumcision and the rest of the legal ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian Faith. For being present at the synagogues of the Jews, and understanding much of the Law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the arguments which the Apostles produced out of the Scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Thus many of the *Greeks* which *came up to worship* at Jerusalem, *devout men out of every nation under heaven,* not *men of Israel,* but yet *fearing God,* did first embrace the Christian Faith. After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes received the Gospel. How much did Jesus work by one St. Paul to *the*

Mat. xxviii. 19. Luke xxiv. 49. Acts ii. 41. Acts iv. 4. Acts v. 14. Acts viii. 1; ix. 31. Acts xxi. 20. πόσαι μυριάδες. John xii. 20. Acts ii. 5. Rom. xv. 18, 19.

obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed! how did he pass *from Jerusalem round* about through Phœnice, Syria, and Arabia, through Asia, Achaia, and Macedonia, even to Illyricum, fully *preaching the Gospel of Christ!* How far did others pass beside
Col. i. 23. St. Paul, that he should speak even of his time, that the *Gospel was preached to every creature under heaven!* Many were the nations, innumerable the people, which received the faith in the Apostles' days: and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their numbers equalize half the Roman empire[61]: and little above two ages after the death of the last Apostle, the emperors of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres
Isa. lx. 3. to his laws, that the *Gentiles* might *come to his light, and kings to*
Isa. xlix. 23. *the brightness of his rising;* that *kings* might become *the nursing fathers, and queens the nursing mothers,* of the Church.

From hence it came to pass, that according to all the predic- 91
tions of the Prophets, the one God of Israel, the Maker of heaven and earth, was acknowledged through the world for the only true God: that the Law given to Israel was taken for the true Law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease when they ceased to be a people; except the moral part thereof, which, as an universal rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man: that all the oracles of the heathen gods, in all places where

61 'Visa est mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est.' *Plin. Epist. ad Trajan. lib.* x. *Epist.* 97. [al. 96.] 'Tanta hominum multitudo, pars pene major civitatis cujusque, in silentio et modestia agimus.' *Tertul. ad Scapul. cap.* 2. [p. 69 D.] 'Si hostes exertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum et copiarum? Plures nimirum Mauri et Marcomanni, ipsique Parthi, vel quantæcunque, unius tamen loci et suorum finium, gentes, quam totius orbis. Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum.' *Idem, Apolog. cap.* 37. [p. 30 B.] 'Potuimus et inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abrupissemus a vobis, suffudisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissio civium, imo etiam et ipsa destitutione punisset: proculdubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum, et stuporem quendam quasi mortui orbis; quæsissetis quibus imperaretis.' *Idem, ibid.* And Irenæus, who wrote before Tertullian, and is mentioned by him, speaks of the Christians in his time living in the court of Rome: 'Quid autem et hi qui in regali aula sunt fideles? nonne ex eis quæ Cæsaris sunt habent utensilia, et his qui non habent unusquisque secundum suam virtutem præstat?' [iv. 30. p. 257.]

Christianity was received, did presently cease, and all the idols or the gods themselves were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of Hosts had spoken concerning those times expressly; *It shall come to pass in that day that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land.* Zech. xiii. 2.

Now being this general reception of the Gospel was so anciently, so frequently foretold, being the same was so clearly and universally performed; even this might seem sufficient to persuade that Jesus is Christ. But lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall farther shew, that it is impossible Jesus should have been so received for the true Messias, had he not been so; or that his doctrine, which teacheth him to be the Christ, should be admitted by all nations for Divine, had it not been such. For whether we look upon the nature of the doctrine taught, the condition of the teachers of it, or the manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging Jesus for his Son, the doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the Apostles what he had foretold by the Prophets.

As for the nature of the doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success. For, first, it absolutely condemned all other religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the Roman, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained precepts far more ungrateful and troublesome to flesh and blood, and contrariant to the general inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of ourselves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the cross. Thirdly, it enforced those precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such promises as were as seemingly incredible and unperceivable. For they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our sense; but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that which then seemed as absolutely impossible, the resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfilled in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listening to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and

2 Tim. iii. 12. in sum, (*All that would live godly in Christ Jesus should suffer persecution.*)

If we look upon the teachers of this doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any such success. The first revealer and promulger bred in the house of a carpenter, brought up at the feet of no professor, despised by the high priests, the Scribes and Pharisees, and all the learned in the religion of his nation; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffetted, spit upon, condemned, crucified; betrayed in his life by one disciple, denied by another; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the
1 Cor. i. 23. propagation of the Gospel in this Author of it, *Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness?* what in those which followed him, sent by him, and thence called Apostles, men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, 92
by profession low and inglorious? How can we conceive that all the schools and universities in the world should give way to them, and the kingdoms and empires should at last come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed Divine, except that Jesus, whom they testified to be the Christ, were truly so?

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this doctrine to the world, it will add no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of success. For in their delivery they used no such rhetorical expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumentation, as thereby to persuade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compel, no corporal menaces to affright mankind into a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words they nakedly delivered what
1 Cor. ii. 4. they had seen and heard, *preaching, not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit.* It is not then rationally imaginable, that so many nations should forsake their own religions, so many ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, only that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their natural inclinations, and that upon such promises as seemed not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and notwithstanding those predictions which did assure them, upon the receiving of that doctrine, to be exposed to all kind of misery: that they should do this upon the authority of him, who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the persuasion of them who were

both illiterate and obscure: that they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force. I say, it is no way imaginable how this should come to pass, had not the doctrine of the Gospel, which did thus prevail, been certainly Divine; had not the light of the Word, which thus dispelled the clouds of all former religions, come from heaven; had not that *Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith,* been the true Messias. Heb. xii. 2.

To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the Messias was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended; he who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the Prophets foretold of the birth of the Messias; he which taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffered all those indignities, received all that glory, which the Messias was to teach, do, suffer, and receive; he whose doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the Messias; he was certainly the true Messias. (But we have already sufficiently shewed that all these things are exactly fulfilled in Jesus, and in him alone.) We must therefore acknowledge and profess that this Jesus is the promised Messias, that is, the Christ.

Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, *Jesus is the Christ,* and shewed the interpretation of the word *Christ* to be *anointed;* we find it yet necessary for the explication of this Article, to inquire what was the end or immediate effect of his unction [62], and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

For the first, as the Messias was foretold, so was he typified: nor were the actions prescribed under the Law less predictive than the words of the Prophets. Nay, whosoever were then anointed, were therefore so, because he was to be anointed [63]. Now it is evident that among the Jews they were wont to anoint those which were appointed as kings over them [64]: *So Samuel said unto Saul, the Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel.* When Saul was rejected, and David pro- 1 Sam. xv. 1.

62 'In Christi nomine subauditur qui unxit, et ipse qui unctus est, et ipsa unctio in qua unctus est.' *Iren. lib.* iii. *cap.* 20. [c. 18. §. 3. p. 210.]

63 Οἱ βασιλεῖς πάντες καὶ οἱ χριστοὶ ἀπὸ τούτου μετέσχον καὶ βασιλεῖς καλεῖσθαι καὶ χριστοί. *Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 86. [p. 184 A.]

64 'Christus a chrismate dicitur: quia sicut antiqui reges a sacerdotibus oleo sacro profundebantur, sic Christus Spiritus Sancti infusione repletus est.' *Author Serm.* 131. *de Temp.* [al. Serm. 242. §. 3. S. Aug. vol. v. App. p. 398 A.]

1 Sam. xvi. 12. duced before Samuel, *the Lord said, Arise, anoint him, for this is he.* And some may have contented themselves with this [65], that the Messias was to be a King. But not only the kings, but beside, and long before them, the high priests were also anointed; 93 insomuch as the anointed [66], in their common language, signified their high priest. And because these two were most constantly anointed, therefore divers [67] have thought it sufficient to assert, that the Messias was to be a King and a Priest. But being not only the high priests and kings were actually anointed (though 1 Kings xix. 15, 16. they principally and most frequently); for *the Lord said unto* Elias, *Go anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel, and Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be Prophet in thy room:* therefore hence it hath been concluded [68] that the three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, belonged to Jesus as the Christ, and

65 'Sicut nunc Romanis indumentum purpuræ insigne est regiæ dignitatis assumptæ: sic illis unctio sacri unguenti nomen ac potestatem regiam conferebat.' *Lactan. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 257.]

66 For though at the first the sons of Aaron were anointed as well as Aaron, as appears Exod. xl. 15. *Thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may administer to me in the priest's office:* yet they were not after anointed, but the successors of Aaron only: *For,* saith the text, *their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations:* and therefore after this first anointing they shall need no more, only the successors in the high-priesthood shall reiterate the unction: from whence *the priest that is anointed* afterwards signified the high priest, as Lev. iv. 3. הכהן המשיח LXX. Ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος by way of explication, whereas verse the 5th and the 16th of the same chapter, and vi. 22. they render it by a bare translation, Ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός· which by the vulgar Latin is translated, *Sacerdos qui jure patri succederet,* because no other but the son which succeeded the father in the office of the high priest was afterwards anointed: as the Arabic, *Et similiter sacerdos successor de filiis suis.* For in the anointing of Aaron and his sons, נמשחו כל הבאים אחריהם להיות כהנים ולוה לא הוצרכו למשוח אחר וה כי אם כהן גדול: *Levi Ben Gerson* 1 *Kings* i. 34.

67 As Lactantius; 'Erat Judæis ante præceptum ut sacrum conficerent unguentum, quo perungi possent ii qui vocabantur ad sacerdotium vel ad regnum.' *lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 257.] And St. Augustin; 'Prioribus Veteris Testamenti temporibus ad duas solas personas pertinebat unctio.' *Enarr.* 2. *Psal.* xxvi. [§. 2. vol. iv. part. 1. p. 119 B.] 'Christus vel pontificale vel regium nomen est. Nam prius et Pontifices unguento chrismatis consecrabantur et Reges.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 6. p. cciii.]

68 Τοῦτο τὸ χρίσμα μὴ μόνον ἀρχιερεῦσι παραδοθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα προφήταις καὶ βασιλεῦσιν, οἷς καὶ αὐτοῖς τούτῳ χρίεσθαι μόνοις ἐξὸν ἦν τῷ μύρῳ. *Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 172 A.] *et Hist. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [p. 12.] Wherefore St. Augustin recollecting a place in his 83 questions, in which he had taught the two fishes in the Gospel 'duas illas personas significare quibus populus ille regebatur, ut per eas conciliorum moderamen acciperet, regiam scilicet et sacerdotalem, ad quas etiam sacrosancta illa unctio pertinebat,' [Qu. lxi. §. 2. vol. vi. p. 33 F.] makes this particular retraction; 'Dicendum potius fuit, maxime pertinebat, quoniam unctos aliquando legimus et Prophetas.' *Retract. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [vol. i. p. 39 F.]

that upon good reason. For the commonwealth of Israel was totally ordered and disposed, both in the constitution and administration of it, for and with respect unto the Messias. The constitution of that people was made by a sejunction and separation of them from all other nations on the earth: and this began in Abraham, with a peculiar promise of a seed in whom all the nations should be blessed, and be united into one religion. That promised seed was the Messias, the type of whom was Isaac. This separation was continued by the administration of that commonwealth, which was a *royal priesthood:* and that administration of the people did consist in three functions, prophetical, regal, sacerdotal; all which had respect unto the Messias [69], as the scope of all the Prophets, and the complement of their prophecies, as the Lord of the temple, and the end of all the sacrifices for which the temple was erected, as the heir of an eternal priesthood *after the order of Melchizedeck*, and of the throne of David, or an everlasting kingdom. Being then the separation was to cease at the coming of the Messias, being that could not cease so long as the administration of that people stood, being that administration did consist in those three functions, it followeth that those three were to be united in the person of the Messias, who was to make all one, and consequently that the Christ was to be Prophet, Priest, and King.

1 Pet. ii. 9.

Ps. cx. 4.

Again, the redemption or salvation which the Messias was to bring, consisteth in the freeing of a sinner from the state of sin and eternal death into a state of righteousness and eternal life. Now a freedom from sin in respect of the guilt could not be wrought without a sacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was a necessity of a priest; a freedom from sin in respect of the dominion could not be obtained without a revelation of the will of God, and of his wrath against all ungodliness, therefore there was also need of a Prophet; a translation from the state of death
94 into eternal life is not to be effected without absolute authority and irresistible power, therefore a King was also necessary. The

69 Οὐ μόνους δὲ ἄρα τοὺς ἀρχιερωσύνῃ τετιμημένους—τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατεκόσμει παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς βασιλέας· οὓς καὶ αὐτοὺς, πνεύματι θείῳ προφῆται χρίοντες, εἰκονικούς τινας Χριστοὺς ἀπειργάζοντο· ὅτι δὴ καὶ αὐτοί, τῆς τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀληθοῦς Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κατὰ πάντων βασιλεύοντος θείου λόγου, βασιλικῆς καὶ ἀρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τοὺς τύπους δι' ἑαυτῶν ἔφερον· ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν τινὰς διὰ χρίσματος Χριστοὺς ἐν τύπῳ γεγονέναι παρειλήφαμεν. ὡς τούτους ἅπαντας τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ Χριστὸν, τὸν ἔνθεον καὶ οὐράνιον λόγον, ἀναφορὰν ἔχειν, μόνον ἀρχιερέα τῶν ὅλων, καὶ μόνον ἀπάσης τῆς κτίσεως βασιλέα, καὶ μόνον προφητῶν ἀρχιπροφήτην τοῦ Πατρὸς τυγχάνοντα. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [p. 12.]

Messias then, the Redeemer of Israel, was certainly anointed for that end, that he might become Prophet, Priest, and King. And if we believe him whom we call Jesus, that is our Saviour and Redeemer, to be Christ, we must assert him by his unction sent to perform all these three offices.

That Jesus was anointed to the prophetical office, though we need no more to prove it than the prediction of Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor;* the explication of our Saviour, *This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears;* and the confession of the synagogue at Nazareth, who *all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth;* yet we are furnished with more ample and plentiful demonstrations; for whether we consider his preparation, his mission, or his administration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. To Jeremiah indeed God said, *Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the nations;* and of John the Baptist, *He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb.* And if these became singular Prophets by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must his prophetical preparation be, to whose mother it is said, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee?* If the Levites must be *thirty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry*, Jesus will not enter upon the public administration of this office till he *begin to be about thirty years of age.* Then doth the *Holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape like a dove upon him:* then must *a voice come from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.* Never such preparations, never such an inauguration of a Prophet.

Isa. lxi. 1.
Luke iv. 21, 22.
Jer. i. 5.
Luke i. 15.
Luke i. 35.
Num. iv. 47.
Luke iii. 23. iii. 22.

As for his mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formal testimony of John the Baptist, and the more virtual testimony of his miracles. *Behold, I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord,* saith God by Malachy. And John went *before him in the spirit of Elias,* saith another Malachy, even an angel from heaven. This John, or Elias, saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, *and bare record that this is the Son of God.* The Jews took notice of this testimony, who *said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come*

Mal. iv. 5.
Luke i. 17.
John i. 34.
John iii. 26.

unto him; and Jesus himself puts them in mind of it, *Ye sent* John v. 33.
unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth; nay they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable; *John did no* John x. 41.
miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true. But though the witness of John were thus cogent, yet the testimony of miracles was far more irrefragable; *I have greater witness than* John v. 36.
that of John, saith our Saviour, *for the works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* Notwithstanding the precedent record of John, Jesus requireth not an absolute assent unto his doctrine without his miracles; *If I do not the works of my* John x. 37,
Father, believe me not. But upon them he challengeth belief; 38.
But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him. If then Moses and other Prophets, to whom God gave the power of miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the divine works which they wrought; much more efficacious to this purpose must the miracles of Jesus appear, who wrought more wonders than they all. Never therefore was there so manifest a mission of a Prophet.

95 Now the prophetical function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. And the perfect administration of this office must be attributed unto Jesus. For *no* John i. 18.
man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. He *gave unto* John xvii.
the Apostles *the words which* his Father *gave him.* Therefore 8. 14.
he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The confirmation of this doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to persuade it, for *he did no sin, neither was guile* 1 Pet. ii. 22.
found in his mouth; who wrought most powerful and Divine works to confirm it, and was thereby *known* to be *a teacher from* John iii. 2.
God; who died a most painful and shameful death to ratify it, *witnessing a good profession before Pontius Pilate;* which in itself 1 Tim. vi.
unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative 13.
in the raising of himself from death. The propagation and perpetual succession of this doctrine must likewise be attributed unto Jesus, as to no temporary or accidental Prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that function. For *the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets:* and 1 Pet. i. 11.
when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men. For *he gave*

Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12. *some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* It is then most apparent that Jesus was so far Christ, as that he was anointed to the prophetical office, because his preparation for that office was most remarkable, his mission unto that office was undeniable, his administration of that office was infallible.

Now as Jesus was anointed with the unction of Elizeus to the prophetical, so was he also with the unction of Aaron to the sacerdotal office. Not that he was called after the order of Aaron; Heb. vii. 14, 21. *for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood:* but after a more ancient order, according to the prediction of the Psalmist, Ps. cx. 4. *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedeck.* But though he were of another order, yet whatsoever Aaron did as a Priest was wholly typical, and consequently to be fulfilled by the Messias, as he was a Priest. For the priesthood did not begin in Aaron, but was translated and conferred upon his family before his consecration. Exod. xix. 22. We read of *the priests which came near to the Lord;* of Exod. xxiv. 5. *young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord:* which without question were no other than the first-born[70], to whom the priesthood did belong. Jesus therefore, as the first-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and being anointed unto that office, performed every function, by way of oblation, intercession, and benediction. Heb. viii. 3. *Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man* Jesus, if he be an High Priest, *have somewhat also to offer.* Not that he had any thing beside himself, or that there was any peculiar sacrifice allowed to this Priest, to whom, Heb. x. 5. *when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body* Verse 10. *hast thou prepared me:* and, *by the offering of this body of Jesus* Eph. v. 2. *Christ are we sanctified.* For he who is our Priest hath *given himself*[71] *an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.*

70 For the Hebrew בכרי signifying *jurenes*, by all the Targums is rendered בוכרי that is *primogeniti:* and so the Arabic and Persian translations.

71 'Unus ipse erat qui offerebat et quod offerebat.' *S. August.* 'Unum cum illo manebat cui offerebat, unum in se fecit pro quibus offerebat; unus ipse erat qui offerebat et quod offerebat.' *Idem de Trin.* [lib. iv. c. 14. §. 19. vol. viii. p. 823 C.]

Now when Jesus had thus given himself a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entered into the holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our sin. Nor is he prevalent only in his own oblation once offered, but in his constant intercession. *Who is he that condemneth?* saith the Apostle: *it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of* 96 *God; who also maketh intercession for us.* Upon this foundation he buildeth our persuasion, that *he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.* Nor must we look upon this as a servile[72] or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious intercession, as of him to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth. Besides these offerings and intercedings, there was something more required of the Priest, and that is blessing. *Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for ever.* We read of no other sacerdotal act performed by Melchizedeck the Priest of the most high God, but only that of blessing, and that in respect both of God and man: first, *he blessed* man, *and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth:* then, *Blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand.* Now it is observable what the rabbins have delivered, that at the morning sacrifice the priests under the Law did bless the people with the solemn form of benediction, but at the evening sacrifice they blessed them not; to shew that in the evening of the world, the last days, which are the days of the Messias, the benediction of the Law should cease, and the blessing of the Christ take place. When Zachariah the Priest, the father of John Baptist, the forerunner of our Saviour, *executed* his *office before God in the order of his course,* and *the whole multitude of the people waited for him,* to receive his benediction, *he could not speak unto them,* for he was dumb; shewing the power of benediction was now passing to another and far greater Priest, even to Jesus, whose doctrine in the

Rom. viii. 34.

Heb. vii. 25.

1 Chron. xxiii. 13.

Gen. xiv. 19, 20.

Luke i. 8, 19, 21, 22.

72 Παράκλητον ἔχομεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν οὐχ ὡς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προκαλινδούμενον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ προσπίπτοντα δουλικῶς· ἄπαγε τὴν δούλην ὄντως ὑπόνοιαν καὶ ἀναξίαν τοῦ πνεύματος· οὔτε γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο ἐπιζητεῖν, οὔτε τοῦ υἱοῦ πάσχειν, ἢ ὡς περὶ θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι δίκαιον· ἀλλ' οἷς πέπονθεν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, πείθει καρτερεῖν ὡς λόγος καὶ παραινέτης· τοῦτο νοεῖταί μοι ἡ παράκλησις. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 36. [*Orat.* xxx. 14. vol. i. p. 550 C.]

Luke xxiv. 50. mount begins with *Blessed;* who, when he left his Disciples, *lift up his hands and blessed them.* And yet this function is prin-
Acts iii. 26. cipally performed after his resurrection, as it is written, *Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities.* It cannot then be denied that Jesus, who offered up himself a most perfect sacrifice and oblation for sin, who still maketh continual intercession for us, who was raised from the dead, that he might bless us with an everlasting benediction, is a most true and most perfect Priest.

The third office belonging to the Messias was the regal, as appeareth by the most ancient tradition of the Jews[73], and by
Ps. ii. 6. the express predictions of the Prophets. *Yet have I set my*
Isa. ix. 6. *King,* saith the Psalmist, *upon my holy hill of Sion. Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder,* saith the Prophet Isaiah, who calleth him *the Prince of peace,* shewing the perpetuity of his power, and
Isa. ix. 7. particularity of his seat. *Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever.* All which most certainly belongs unto our Jesus, by the unerring interpretation of the angel Gabriel, who promised the blessed Virgin that the
Luke i. 32, 33. *Lord God* should *give unto* her Son *the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* He acknowledgeth himself this office, though by a strange and unlikely representation of it,
Matt. xxi. 4, 5. the riding on an ass; but by that it was *fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting on an ass.* He made as strange a confession of it unto Pilate; for when he said unto
John xviii. 37. him, *Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.* The solemn inauguration into this office was at his ascension into heaven, and his session at the right hand of God: not but that he was by right a King before, but the full and public
Eph. i. 20, 21. execution was deferred till then, *when God raised him from the* 97 *dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places,*

73 For the Chaldee Paraphrase in the most places where it mentioneth the Messias doth it with the addition of King: מלכא משיחא.

far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion. Then he, whose *name is called the Word of God, had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.* Rev. xix. 13, 16.

This regal office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting, and rewarding of his people; partly in the coercing, condemning, and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a Law by which they walk; by furnishing them with his grace, by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortal bodies; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil; by supporting them in all their afflictions; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus rules and protects here, he rewards hereafter in a most royal manner, making them *kings and priests unto God and his Father.* Rev. i. 6. On the contrary, he sheweth his regal dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporal or spiritual enemies. Temporal, as the Jews and Romans, who joined together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his Disciples, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom:* and in that kingdom he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the Jews by the Roman armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves. But beside these visible enemies, there are other spiritual, those which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his Father's kingdom, those which refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, *These mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.* Thus sin, Satan, and death, being the enemies to his kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order. *For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.* Thus is our Jesus become the *Prince of the kings of the earth;* thus is the *Lamb* acknowledged to be *Lord of lords, and King of kings.*

Matt. xvi. 28.

Luke xix. 27.

1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.

Rev. i. 5; xvii. 14.

Wherefore seeing we have already shewed that the prophetical, sacerdotal, and regal offices were to belong unto the promised Messias, as the proper end and immediate effect of his unction; seeing we have likewise declared how Jesus was

anointed to these offices, and hath and doth actually perform the same in all the functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the Christ, but only to shew the manner of this unction, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the Law, who were the types of the Messias, is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible; God appointed an oil to be made, and appropriated it to that use; and the pouring that oil upon the body of any person was his anointing to that office for which he was designed. But being that oil so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred years before our Saviour's birth, being the custom of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased, being howsoever we never read that Jesus was at all anointed with oil; it remaineth still worthy our inquiry, how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former unctions; and what it was which answered to that oil, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

The Jews tell us[74], that the anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, and that it shall be found and produced again 98
when the Messias comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the kings and high priests of his days. But though the loss of that oil bespake the destruction of that nation, yet the Christ which was to come needed no such unction for his consecration; there being as great a difference between the typical and correspondent oil, as between the representing and represented Christ. The Prophet David calleth it not by the vulgar name of oil of
Ps. xlv. 7. unction, but *the oil of gladness*. For though that place may in the first sense be understood of Solomon, whom when Zadoc
1 Kings i. 39, 40. the Priest anointed, *they blew the trumpet, and all the people said, God save King Solomon. And all the people came up after him,*

74 בימות המשיח עתיד הקדוש ברוך הוא להחזיר לעמו אותו שמן המשחא שעשה משה שנגנז עם הארון ובו ימשחו המלכים והכהנים הגדולים בימים ההם: *In the days of the Messias God will restore unto his people the oil of unction which Moses made, which was hidden with the ark; and the kings and high priests shall be anointed with it in those days. Abarbanel Comment. ad* [30 Exod. v. 22. art. 13, f. 167 Q.] Now the loss of that oil, which they call the hiding of it, may well be thought to foretell the period of the Mosaical administration, being they confess that after that they never had any priests anointed, because they had no power to make the same oil. So plainly confesseth the same Abarbanel, f. 166 1. לא היה כהן משוח בבית שני לפי שכבר היה נגנז שמן המשחה שנגנזו יאשיהו עם שאר הדברים הקדושים ולא היה להם רשות לעשותו:

and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them; though from thence it might be said of him, *Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows:* yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God[75], (*therefore God, thy God,*) the oil with which that God is anointed must in the ultimate and highest sense signify a far greater gladness than that at Solomon's coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the Church of God. Ps. xlv. 7.

The ancients tell us that this oil is the Divinity itself[76], and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghost. St. Peter teacheth us *how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.* Now though there can be no question but the Spirit is the oil, yet there is some doubt, when Jesus was anointed with it. For we know the angel said unto the blessed Virgin, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* From whence it appeareth that from the conception or at the incarnation, Jesus was sanctified by the Holy Ghost and the power of the Highest, and so consequently, as St. Peter spake, he was *anointed*[77] then *with the Holy Ghost and with* Acts x. 38. Luke i. 35.

75 'Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei et qui unxit, intellige. Unde et Aquila *Elohim* אלהים verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo, interpretatur, dicens, θεέ· et nos propter intelligentiam *Dee* posuimus, quod Latina lingua non recipit, ne quis perverse putet Deum dilecti et amantissimi et regis bis Patrem nominari.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 140. [Epist. LXV. 13. vol. i. p. 380 E.] 'Quod sequitur, *Unxit te, Deus, Deus tuus,* primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo; quod satis miror cur Aquila non, ut cœperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, bis nominans Deum, qui supradictum unxerit Deum.' *Idem, ibid.* [p. 381 E.]

76 So Gregory Nazianzenus expounds the place: "Ον ἔχρισεν ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ, χρίσας τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τῇ θεότητι, ὥστε ποιῆσαι τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν. And again, Χριστὸς δὲ, διὰ τὴν θεότητα· (not that his Divinity was anointed, or Christ anointed in respect of his Divinity; but that he was anointed in his Humanity by his Divinity;) χρίσις γὰρ αὕτη τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, οὐκ ἐνεργείᾳ κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους χριστοὺς ἀγιάζουσα· παρουσίᾳ δὲ ὅλου τοῦ χρίοντος· ἦς ἔργον, ἄνθρωπον ἀκοῦσαι τὸ χρίον, καὶ ποιῆσαι θεὸν τὸ χριόμενον. *Orat.* 36. [*Orat.* XXX. 21. vol. i. p. 555 D.]

77 Χριστὸς ἐχρίσθη ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς τῷ χρίσματι τῆς σαρκώσεως. *Germanus Constant.* [Galland. xiii. p. 204 A.] Κεχρίσθαι δὲ οὐχ ἑτέρως φαμὲν τὸν υἱὸν, ἢ ὅτι κατὰ σάρκα γενόμενον, δηλονότι καθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. *Titus Bostrens.* [p. 783 B.] 'Deus est qui ungit, et Deus qui secundum carnem ungitur Dei filius. Denique quos habet unctionis suæ Christus nisi in carne consortes? Vides igitur quia Deus a Deo unctus, sed in assumptione naturæ unctus humanæ Dei filius designatur.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib.* i. cap. 3. [§. 24. vol. ii. p. 448 D.] 'Hæc omnia carni conveniunt, cui piissimum et gloriosissimum Verbum unitum est pro salute cunctorum.' *Cassiodor. in Psal.* xliv. [v. 9. vol. ii. p. 152.]

power. Again, being we read that after he was thirty years of age, the Spirit *like a dove descended and lighted upon him*, and he, descending *in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, said unto them of Nazareth, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*, meaning that of Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel:* hence hath it been also collected, that his unction was performed at his Baptism[78]. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviour's unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. David, the most undoubted type of the Messias, was anointed at Bethlehem; for there *Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David, from that day forward.* Of which unction those words of God must necessarily be understood, *I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed* 99 *him.* And yet he was again anointed at Hebron; first, *over the house of Judah*, then over *all the tribes of Israel.* As therefore David at his first unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the throne of Israel, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of Saul and acceptation of the tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he should actually enter upon his regal office, he was again anointed: so our Jesus, the Son of David, was first sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at his conception, and thereby received a right unto, and was prepared for, all those offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world; but when he was to enter upon the actual and full performance of all those functions which belonged to him, then doth the same Spirit which had sanctified him at his conception visibly descend upon him at his inauguration. And that most properly upon his baptism, because, according to the customs of those ancient nations, washing was wont to precede

Matt. iii. 16. Luke iv. 14, 21.

1 Sam. xvi. 13.

Ps. lxxxix. 20.

2 Sam. ii. 4: v. 1, 3.

78 St. Jerom, mentioning that place of the Psalm, 'Quando consortes nominantur, naturam carnis intellige; quia Deus consortes substantiæ suæ non habet. Et quia erat unctio spiritualis et nequaquam humani corporis, (ut fuit in sacerdotibus Judæorum) idcirco præ consortibus, id est, cæteris sanctis, unctus esse memoratur. Cujus unctio illo expleta est tempore quando baptizatus est in Jordane, et Spiritus Sanctus in specie columbæ descendit super eum, et mansit in illo.' *Comment. in Esaiam, cap.* 61. [vol. iv. p. 731 E.] 'In illa columba quæ super Dominum post baptisma descendit, ipse cum sacramento baptismatis et veri sacerdotii jura suscepit, fuso videlicet super eum oleo exultationis, de quo Psalmista canit; *Unxit te*, inquit, *Deus, Deus tuus oleo lætitiæ præ consortibus tuis.*' *Pet. Damianus, Opusc.* vi. *cap.* 4. [vol. iii. p. 89.]

their unctions[79]: wherefore *Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove:* as David sent Solomon to be anointed at Gihon: from whence arose that ancient observation of the Rabbins, *that kings were not to be anointed but by a fountain*[80]. Matt. iii. 16.

Now as we have shewed that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost; lest any should deny any such descension to be a proper or sufficient unction, we shall farther make it appear, that the effusion, or action of the Spirit, eminently containeth whatsoever the Jews have imagined to be performed or signified by those legal anointings. Two very good reasons they render,

79 As appears by those entertainments so frequently mentioned by Homer in his Odyssey, as when Telemachus is entertained by Nestor;

Τόφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λοῦσεν καλὴ Πολυκάστη,
Νέστορος ὁπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ Νηληϊάδαο.
Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ. 'Οδ. γ'. 464.

And Telemachus and Pisistratus are invited to the court of Menelaus;

Ἐς β' ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐυξέστας λούσαντο·
Τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμωαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ. 'Οδ. δ'. 48.

Thus Ulysses is entertained, 'Οδ. θ'. Thus Pyræus and Telemachus, 'Οδ. ρ'. And Venus, returning to Paphus, is so ordered by the *Charites;*

Ἔνθα δέ μιν Χάριτες λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ
Ἀμβρότῳ, οἷα θεοὺς ἐπενήνοθεν αἰὲν ἐόντας. 'Οδ. θ'. 364.

So Helena speaks of her entertaining Ulysses in a disguise;

Ἀλλ' ὅτε δή μιν ἐγὼν ἐλόευν καὶ χρῖον ἐλαίῳ. 'Οδ. δ'. 252.

It is apparent that this was the custom of the ancient Greeks. Of which Eustathius gives this reason; Ἐλαίῳ ἐχρίοντο οἱ λουσάμενοι ἐμπλάττοντες τοὺς σωματικοὺς πόρους, ὡς ἂν μετὰ λουτρὸν στέγοιεν τὴν ὑγρότητα. This custom was so ancient and general, that the Greeks had one word to express this anointing with oil after washing with water, which they called χύτλα and χυτλῶσαι. *Etymol.* Χυτλῶσαι, οὐχ ἁπλῶς τὸ ἀλεῖψαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ λουτρῷ ἀλείψασθαι. *Schol. Aristoph.* [Vesp. 1206.] Χύτλα δὲ κυρίως, τὸ ὑγρὸν ἔτι ἀπὸ ὕδατος ὄντος τοῦ σώματος ἀλείψασθαι. *Hesych.* Χύτλα, τὸ ἐφ' ὕδατος ἔλαιον· and Χυτλῶσαι, τὸ ἀλεῖψαι μετὰ τὸ λούσασθαι. Hence, when Nausicaa went unto the pools to wash, her mother gave her a box of oil;

Δῶκε δὲ χρυσείῃ ἐν ληκύθῳ ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον,
Εἵως χυτλώσαιτο σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξίν. 'Οδ. ζ'. 80.

Where the old Scholiast, Χυτλῶσαιτο, λουσαμένη ἀλείψαιτο· and Eustathius, Εἵως χυτλώσαιτο, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅπως μετὰ λουτρὸν χυτλωθείη ἀλειψαμένη· which exposition is warranted by the performance after mentioned,

Αἱ δὲ λοεσσάμεναι καὶ χρισσάμεναι λίπ' ἐλαίῳ. *Ibid.* 96.

And as this was the ancient custom of the Greeks, so was it also the common custom of the Jews, as appears by the words of Naomi to Ruth, *Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee.* Ruth iii. 3.

80 They say in the Gemara, that this is a maxim of the Doctors, אמרו בגמרא תנו רבנן אין מושחין את המלכים אלא על המעיין: *Abarbanel in* 30 *Exod.* art. 11, f. 167. 1. The end of which ceremony was to shew the prolonging of his kingdom who was so anointed; and the original is referred to the anointing of Solomon, 1 Kings i. 39. For so it followeth in the Talmud, כדי שתמשך מלכותם שנא' והורדתם אותו על גיחון: *Abarbanel, ibid.*

why God did command the use of such anointing oil, as in respect of the action. First, that it might signify the divine election of that person, and designation to that office: from whence it was necessary that it should be performed by a prophet, who understood the will of God. Secondly, that by it the person anointed might be made fit to receive the divine influx. For the first, it is evident there could be no such infallible sign of the divine designation of Jesus to his offices, as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with *a voice from heaven*, instead of the hand of a prophet, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* For the second, this spiritual unction was so far from giving less than an aptitude to receive the Divine influx, that it was that Divine influx, nay, the Divinity itself, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily. 100

Matt. iii. 17.

In respect of the matter, they give two causes why it was oil, and not any other liquor. First, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The olive was the first of trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its *fatness, wherewith they honour God and man.* Therefore it was fit that those persons which were called to a greater dignity than the rest of the Jews, should be consecrated by oil, as the best sign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour than to be the Son of God, the *beloved Son*, as Jesus was proclaimed at this unction, by which he was consecrated to such an office as will obtain him a name far above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oil continueth uncorrupted longer than any other liquor. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not only itself, but other things[81], from corruption; hence they conclude it fit their kings and priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oil, the most proper emblem of eternity. But even by this reason of their own, their unction is ceased, being the succession of their kings and priests is long since cut off, and their eternal and eternizing oil lost long before, and only that one Jesus, who was anointed with the most spiritual oil,

Judg. ix. 9.

81 'Unguenta optime servantur in alabastris, odores in oleo.' *Plin. Hist. lib.* xiii. *cap.* 2. [c. 3.] 'Existimatur et ebori vindicando a carie utile esse. Certe simulacrum Saturni Romæ intus oleo repletum est.' *Idem, lib.* xv. *cap.* 7. And whosoever made that statue at Rome, seems to have had his art out of Greece, from that famous ivory statue made by Phidias. Οὗτος γὰρ μετὰ τὸ κατασκευάσαι τὸ Πισαῖον εἴδωλον, (ἐξ ἐλέφαντος δὲ τοῦτο ἦν) ἔλαιον ἐκχεῖσθαι προσέταξεν ἀμφὶ τοὺς πόδας ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἀγάλματος, ἀθάνατον εἰς δύναμιν φυλάσσων αὐτό. *Proclus apud Epiphan. Hær.* 64. §. 18. [vol. i. p. 542 C.]

continueth for ever; and therefore *hath an unchangeable priesthood,* as being *made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.* Heb. vii. 24, 16.

Beside, they observe, that simple oil without any mixture was sufficient for the candlestick; but that which was designed for unction must be compounded with principal spices, which signify a good name, always to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity by the most laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was such an admixtion of spices, as in the unction of our Saviour, by which he was indued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was enabled to *offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet smelling savour.* For as he was *full of grace and truth;* so *of his fulness have we all received, grace for grace:* and as we *have received anointing of him,* so we *are unto God a sweet savour of Christ.* Eph. v. 2. John i. 14, 16. 1 John ii. 27; 2 Cor. ii. 15.

Again, it was sufficient to anoint the vessels of the sanctuary in any part; but it was particularly commanded that the oil should be poured upon the head of the kings and priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignity, and original of all the members of the body [82]. This was more eminently fulfilled in Jesus, who by his unction, or as Christ, became *the Head of the Church;* nay *the Head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* Col. i. 18; ii. 10, 19.

Lastly, they observe, that though in the vessels nothing but a single unction was required; yet in the kings and priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both unction and affusion, (as it is written, *He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him:*) the first to signify their separation, the second to assure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear than that our Christ was anointed by affusion, whether we look upon his conception, *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee;* or his inauguration, *the Spirit descended and lighted upon him?* And thus, according unto all particulars required by the Jews themselves to complete their legal unctions, we have sufficiently shewed that Jesus was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God. Lev. viii. 12. Luke i. 35. Mat. iii. 16.

82 According to the etymology in the Hebrew language, of which Abarbanel takes notice; ולכן נקרא ראש כי הוא ראשית לכל האברים והיותו מעולה שבהם: [art. 4, f. 166. 3.]

Wherefore being we have shewn that a Messias was to come 101
into the world; being we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that Jesus born in the days of Herod was and is that promised Messias; being we have farther declared that he was anointed to those offices which belonged to the Messias, and actually did and doth still perform them all; and that his anointing was by the immediate affusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the legal and typical unction: I cannot see what farther can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that *Jesus is the Christ.*

The necessity of believing this part of the Article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our Jesus, except he were the Christ. For he could not reveal the way of salvation, except he were a Prophet; he could not work out that salvation revealed, except he were a Priest; he could not confer that salvation upon us, except he were a King; he could not be Prophet, Priest, and King, except he were the Christ. This was the fundamental doctrine which the Apostles not only testified, as they did that of the resurrection, but argued, proved, and demonstrated out of the Law and the Prophets. We find St. Paul at Thessalonica *three Sabbath-days reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.* We find him again at Corinth *pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jews, that Jesus was Christ.* Thus Apollos, by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, *mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures, that Jesus was Christ.* This was the touchstone by which all men at first were tried, whether they were Christian or Antichristian. *For whosoever believeth,* saith St. John, *that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.* What greater commendation of the assertion of this truth? *Who is a liar,* saith the same Apostle, *but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? this man is the Antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son.* What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

Acts xvii. 2, 3.

Acts xviii. 5.

Acts xviii. 28.

1 John v. 1.

1 John ii. 22.

Secondly, as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamental truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations; because, except it hath so, it cannot clearly be

maintained. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant, than to pretend to demonstrate a truth as infallible, and at the same time to shew it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth faith in Christ already come, and liveth not according to that profession; for thereby he proveth, as far as he is able, that the true Christ is not yet come, at least that Jesus is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jews that our Saviour who did and suffered so much, is the true Messias: but by our lives we recall our arguments, and strengthen their wilful opposition. For there was certainly a promise, that when Christ should come, *the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard* Isa. xi. 6. *should lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child should lead them;* that is, there should be so much love, unanimity, and brotherly kindness in the kingdom of Christ, that all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas if we look upon ourselves, we must confess there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptoms of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, than in those which make profession of the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold, that when *the law* Isa. ii. 3, 4. *should go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, they should beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation should not lift up sword against* 102 *nation, neither should they learn war any more.* Whereas there is no other art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not only as lawful, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendom divided into several kingdoms and principalities: what are all these but so many public enemies, either exercising or designing war? The Church was not more famous, or did more increase by the first blood which was shed in the primitive times through the external violence of ten persecutions, than now it is infamous, and declines, through constant violence, fraud, and rapine, through public engagements of the greatest empires in arms, through civil and intestine wars, and, lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by massacres. It was likewise prophesied of the days of the Messias, that all idolatry should totally cease, Zech. xiii. that all false teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits 2. restrained. And can we think that the Jews, who really abhor

the thoughts of worshipping an image, can ever be persuaded there is no idolatry committed in the Christian Church? Or can we excuse ourselves in the least degree from the plague of the locusts of Egypt, the false teachers? Can so many schisms and sects arise, and spread, can so many heresies be acknowledged and countenanced, without false prophets and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian love and charity, if we would appear true lovers of peace and tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations of idolatry, false doctrine, and heresy, let us often remember what we ever profess in our Creed, that Jesus is the Christ, that the kingdom of the Messias cannot consist with these impieties.

Thirdly, the necessity of this belief appeareth in respect of those offices which belong to Jesus, as he is the Christ. We must look upon him as upon the Prophet anointed by God to preach the Gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his doctrine. Though Moses and Elias be together with him in the mount, yet the voice from heaven speaketh of none but Jesus, *Hear ye him.* He is that Wisdom, the *delight of God,* crying in the Proverbs, *Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors. There is one thing needful,* saith our Saviour; *and Mary chose that good part,* who *sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word.* Which devout posture teacheth us, as a willingness to hear, so a readiness to obey: and the proper effect which the belief of this prophetical office worketh in us, is our *obedience of faith.* We must farther consider him as our High Priest, that we may thereby add confidence to that obedience. For we have *boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus;* yea, *having an High Priest over the house of God,* we may *draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.* And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us. For if Christ have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him: if we be *bought with a price,* we are no longer our own; but we must *glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's.* Again, an apprehension of him as a King is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him. *Send the lamb to the Ruler of the earth,* do him homage, acknowledge him your King, shew yourselves faithful and obedient subjects. We can pretend, and he hath required, no less. As soon as he let the Apostles understand that *all*

Matt. xvii. 5.
Prov. viii. 30, 34.
Luke x. 42. 39.
Rom. xvi. 26.
Heb. x. 19, 21, 22.
1 Cor. vi. 20.
Isa. xvi. 1.
Mat. xxviii. 18, 20.

power was given unto him in heaven and in earth, he charged them to *teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them.* Can we imagine he should so strictly enjoin subjection to *higher powers,* the highest of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted *far above all principalities and powers,* and is *set down at the right hand of God?* It is observable that in the description of the coming of
103 the Son of Man, it is said, *The King shall say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you:* which title, as it secures our hope, in respect of his power; as it magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance; so also it teacheth us the indispensable condition of obedience.

Rom. xiii. 1. Eph. i. 20, 21. Matt. xxv. 34.

Fourthly, the belief of Jesus the Christ is necessary to instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how far we stand obliged by owning that name. Those who did first embrace the faith were styled disciples[83], (as when *the number of the disciples was multiplied,*) or *believers,* or *brethren,* or *men of the Church*[84], or *callers upon the name of Christ,* or *men of the way*[85]; or by their ene-

Acts vi. 1, 7.

83 For when our Saviour gave that command to his Apostles, Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *Go make all nations disciples,* they which delivered the Gospel were μαθητεύοντες, they which were taught it and received it were at that time μαθητευθέντες, and after by a name habitual μαθηταί, translated by Tertullian, *discentes,* ordinarily *discipuli.* Μαθητὴς οὖν ἐστὶν, ὡς μανθάνομεν παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, πᾶς ὁ τῷ Κυρίῳ προσερχόμενος, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ, τουτέστιν, ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, πιστεύειν τε καὶ πείθεσθαι αὐτῷ ὡς δεσπότῃ, καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἰατρῷ, καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἀληθείας, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου. [S. Basil. de Bapt. lib. i. c. 2. vol. ii. p. 625 A.] Thus then, in the language of the Scriptures, μαθητεύειν τινά, is *to make a disciple;* as μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανούς, Acts xiv. 21. Μαθητεύειν τινί, *to be a disciple;* as Joseph of Arimathæa, Ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Matt. xxvii. 57. Μαθητευθῆναι the same; as Γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matt. xiii. 52. Thus μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, is often used by St. Basil *de Baptismate,* whose title is, Ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος [vol. ii. p. 624], according to our Saviour's method. Hence those which were first converted to the faith were called μαθηταί, as the disciples of Christ their Doctor and Master.

84 Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, as when Herod stretched forth his hand, κακῶσαί τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, [Acts xii. 1.] *to mischief some of those which were of the Church.*

85 As when Saul went down to Damascus with a commission, Ὅπως ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ· Acts ix. 2. we translate it, *any of this way,* when there was no way mentioned to which the pronoun *this* should have relation; nor is ἡ ὁδός in the Greek any more than *the way.* So when St. Paul went to the Synagogue at Corinth, divers were hardened and believed not, κακολογοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους, Acts xix. 9. here we translate it, *spake evil of that way;* but Beza has left his *Articulus pronominis vice fungitur,* which he had from Erasmus, and hath otherwise supplied it; *male loquentes de via Dei:* and the old translation, which in the former had *hujus vice,* in this hath simply *male-*

mies, *Nazarens*, and *Galileans*. But in a short time they gained a name derived from their Saviour, though not from that name of his which signifieth salvation; for from Christ they were called *Christians*. A title so honourable, and of such concernment, that St. Luke hath thought fit to mention the city in
Acts xi. 26. which that name first was heard. *And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch*[86], as the Scriptures assure us; so named by Euodius*, the Bishop of that place, as ecclesiastical

dicentes viæ: and certainly ἡ ὁδός is nothing but *the way*. Again, at Ephesus, Ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, Acts xix. 23. *de via: Vet. transl.* Beza again, *ob viam Dei*, but it is nothing but *the way*. Thus Felix put off St. Paul, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, xxiv. 22. *till he had a more exact knowledge of the way:* Vet. translat. *de via hac;* Beza *ad sectam istam*. Whereas then the phrase is so simply and so frequently the same, it can be nothing else but the word then in use to signify the religion which the Christians professed. And so some also of the ancients seem to have spoken, as appears by the language of the Melchizedecians, Χριστὸς ἐξελέγη, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καλέσῃ ἐκ πολλῶν ὁδῶν εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἀπέστρεψεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ εἰδώλων, καὶ ὑπέδειξεν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδόν. [Epiphan. *Hær.* lv. 8. p. 474 C.] and in that description of the Gallican persecution, Ἔμειναν δὲ ἔξω οἱ μηδὲ ἴχνος πώποτε πίστεως, μηδὲ αἴσθησιν ἐνδύματος νυμφικοῦ, μηδὲ ἔννοιαν φόβου Θεοῦ σχόντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς αὐτῶν βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδόν. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. [p. 208.]

[86] St. Luke noteth the place, but neither the time when, nor person by whom this name was given. Tertullian seems to make it as ancient as the reign of Tiberius. 'Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum intravit.' *Apolog. cap.* 5. [p. 6 B.] But I conceive indeed he speaks not of the name, but of the religion: for so he may well be thought to expound himself, saying soon after, 'Census istius disciplinæ, ut jam edidimus, a Tiberio est.' *cap.* 7. [p. 7 D.] However the name of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberius, nor, as I think, as Caius. Some ancient author in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when St. Peter had ordained Euodius Bishop of Antioch. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου βασιλέως Ῥώμης, Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου χειροτονήσαντος Εὐόδιον, μετωνομάσθησαν οἱ πάλαι λεγόμενοι Ναζαραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι Χριστιανοί. *Suid. in* Ναζαραῖος *and in* Χριστιανοί. And Johannes Antiochenus confirms not only the time, but tells us that Euodius the Bishop was the author of the name. Καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ (Κλαυδίου) Χριστιανοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπισκόπου Εὐοδίου προσομιλήσαντος αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπιθήσαντος αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο· πρώην γὰρ Ναζαραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ Χριστιανοί. [Chronographia, p. 318.] Thus the name of Christian was first brought into use at Antioch, by Euodius the bishop of the place, and hath ever since been continued as the most proper appellation which could be given unto our profession, being derived from *the Author and Finisher of our faith*. 'At enim secta oditur in nomine utique sui auctoris. Quid novi, si aliqua disciplina de magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne Philosophi de auctoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? Etiam a locis conventiculorum et stationum suarum, Stoici, Academici? Æque Medici ab Erasistrato, et Grammatici ab Aristarcho, Coqui etiam ab Apicio? Nec tamen quenquam offendit professio nominis cum institutione transmissi ab institutore.' *Tertul. Apolog. cap.* 3. [p. 5 A.]

* [That Euodius was the first Bishop of Antioch, is said by several ancient writers: but it is not certain that he was appointed when the name of Christian was first used. See Tillemont, *Mémoires*, tom. II. part. II. p. 44, 442.]

history informs us. A name no sooner invented, but embraced by all believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their profession, and relation to the Author and Master whom they served. In which the primitive Christians so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge no other title but that[87], though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this name of greater honour to us, than of obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this; *Let every one that nameth the* 2 Tim. ii.
104 *name of Christ depart from iniquity.* It was a common answer 19.
of the ancient martyrs, *I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done*[88]. The very name was thought to speak something of emendation[89]; and whosoever put it on, became the better man. Except such reformation accompany our profession, there is no advantage in the appellation[90]; nor can we be honoured by that title, while we dishonour him that gives it. If he be therefore called Christ, because anointed; as we derive the name of Christian, so do we receive our unction[91], from him. For as *the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the* Ps. cxxxiii.
beard, even Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his 2.
garments: so the Spirit, which without measure was poured

87 As we read of Sanctus, a Deacon at Vienna, in a hot persecution of the French Church, who, being in the midst of tortures, was troubled with several questions, which the Gentiles usually then asked, to try if they could extort any confession of any wicked actions practised secretly by the Christians; yet would not give any other answer to any question, than that he was a Christian. Τοσαύτῃ ὑποστάσει ἀντιπαρετάξατο αὐτοῖς, ὥστε μήτε τὸ ἴδιον κατειπεῖν ὄνομα, μήτε ἔθνους, μήτε πόλεως ὅθεν ἦν, μήτε εἰ δοῦλος ἢ ἐλεύθερος εἴη· ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐπερωτώμενα ἀπεκρίνατο τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ, Χριστιανός εἰμι· τοῦτο καὶ ἀντὶ ὀνόματος, καὶ ἀντὶ πόλεως, καὶ ἀντὶ γένους, καὶ ἀντὶ παντὸς ἐπαλλήλως ὡμολόγει. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. [p. 202.] The same doth St. Chrysostom testify of St. Lucian: Ποίας εἶ πατρίδος; Χριστιανός εἰμι, φησί· Τί ἔχεις ἐπιτήδευμα; Χριστιανός εἰμι· Τίνας προγόνους; ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἅπαντα ἔλεγεν, ὅτι Χριστιανός εἰμι. [In S. Lucianum §. 3. vol. ii. p. 528 A.]

88 So Blandina in the French persecution; Ἦν αὐτῆς ἀνάληψις καὶ ἀνάπαυσις καὶ ἀναλγησία τῶν συμβαινόντων, τὸ λέγειν ὅτι Χριστιανή εἰμι, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν φαῦλον γίνεται. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. [p. 202.]

89 'Alii quos ante hoc nomen vagos, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipso denotant quo laudant, cæcitate odii in suffragium impingunt. Quæ mulier! quam lasciva! quam festiva! qui juvenis! quam lusius! quam amasius! facti sunt Christiani: ita nomen emendationi imputatur.' *Tertul. Apol. cap.* 3. [p. 4 C.]

90 'Totum in id revolvitur, ut qui Christiani nominis opus non agit, Christianus non esse videatur. Nomen enim sine actu atque officio suo nihil est.' *Salvian. de Prov. lib.* iv. [c. i. p. 35 E.] Ἐάν τις τὸ ὄνομα λαβὼν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ ἐνυβρίζῃ τὸν Χριστόν, οὐδὲν ὄφελος αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς προσηγορίας. *S. Basil. ad Amphiloch.* [Epist. cxcix. vol. iii. p. 296 C.]

91 'Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur.' *Tertul. Apol. cap.* 3. [p. 4 D.]

upon Christ our head, is by him diffused through all the members of his body[92]. For God hath *established and anointed us in Christ:* We *have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us.* Necessary then it cannot choose but be, that we should know Jesus to be the Christ: because as he is Jesus, that is, our Saviour, by being Christ, that is, anointed; so we can have no share in him as Jesus, except we become truly Christians, and so be in him as Christ, anointed with that unction from the Holy One[93].

2 Cor. i. 21.
1 John ii. 20, 27.

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explication of the title, Christ, we may at last clearly express, and every Christian easily understand, what it is we say when we make our confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus Christ.* I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the Prophets to be the Messias, the Redeemer of Israel, and the expectation of the nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the Messias so promised is already come. I am as certainly persuaded, that the Man born in the days of Herod of the Virgin Mary, by an angel from heaven called Jesus, is that true Messias, so long, so often promised: that, as the Messias, he was anointed to three special offices, belonging to him as the Mediator between God and Man: that he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, and so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King, set down at the right hand of God, far above all principalities and powers, whereby, when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will confer actual, perfect, and eternal happiness upon us. I believe this unction, by which he became the true Messias, was not performed by any material oil, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgment, *I believe in Jesus Christ.*

His only Son.

105

AFTER our Saviour's nomination immediately followeth his filiation: and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be the

92 'Inde apparet Christi corpus nos esse, quia omnes ungimur, et omnes in illo et Christi et Christus sumus, quia quodammodo totus Christus caput et corpus est.' *S. August. in Psal.* xxvi. [Enarr. II. §. 2. vol. iv. part. 1. p. 119 B.]

93 Τοιγαροῦν ἡμεῖς τούτου εἵνεκεν καλούμεθα Χριστιανοί, ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ. *Theoph. ad Autol. lib.* i. [§. 12. p. 345 C.]

Christ, do we confess him to be the *Son of God;* because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the Jews themselves accounted equivalent. Thus Nathanael, that true Israelite, maketh his confession of the Messias; *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* Thus Martha makes expression of her faith; *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.* Thus the high priest maketh his inquisition; *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.* This was the famous confession of St. Peter; *We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.* And the Gospel of St. John was therefore written, that *we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.* Certain then it is that all the Jews, as they looked for a Messias to come, so they believed that Messias to be the Son of God, (although since the coming of our Saviour they have denied it[91]:) and that by reason of a constant interpretation of the second Psalm, as appropriated unto him. And the primitive Christians did at the very beginning include this filial title of our Saviour, together with his names, into the compass of one word[95]. Well therefore after we have expressed our faith in Jesus Christ, is added that which always had so great affinity with it, *the only Son of God.*

John i. 49. John xi. 27. Matt. xxvi. 63. John vi. 69. John xx. 31.

In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the *only Son*[96], that in the phrase of the

94 For when Celsus, in the person of a Jew, had spoken these words, Ἀλλ' εἶπεν ὁ ἐμὸς προφήτης ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ποτὲ, ὅτι ἥξει Θεοῦ υἱὸς, τῶν ὁσίων κριτὴς, καὶ τῶν ἀδίκων κολαστής, Origen says they were most improperly attributed to a Jew, who did look indeed for a Messias, but not for the Son of God, i. e. not under the notion of a Son; Ἰουδαῖος δὲ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι ὅτι προφήτης τις εἶπεν ἥξειν Θεοῦ υἱόν· ὃ γὰρ λέγουσίν ἐστιν, ὅτι ἥξει ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ πολλάκις γε ζητοῦσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐθέως περὶ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς οὐδενὸς ὄντος τοιούτου, οὐδὲ προφητευθέντος. *Cont. Cels. lib.* i. [§. 49. p. 365 E, 366 A.]

95 That is, ΙΧΘΥΣ. 'Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύν nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur.' *Tertul. de Bapt. cap.* 1. [p. 224 A.] Which is thus interpreted by Optatus, 'Cujus piscis nomen secundum appellationem Græcam in uno nomine per singulas literas turbam sanctorum nominum continet, ἰχθύς, quod est Latinum *Jesus Christus Dei Filius Salvator.*' *Lib.* iii. [c. 2. p. 52.]

96 The Latins indeed generally use the word *unicum.* So Ruffinus: 'Et in unico filio ejus:' [§. 6. p. cciii.] which is so far from being in his apprehension the same with *unigenitus,* that he refers it as well to Lord as Son. 'Hic ergo Jesus Christus, Filius unicus Dei, qui est et Dominus noster unicus, et ad Filium referri et ad Dominum potest.' (§. 8. p. ccv.] So St. Augustin in *Enchiridio, cap.* 34. and Leo *Epist.* 10. [Ep. xxiv.] Which is therefore to be observed, because in the ancient copies of those Epistles the word *unicum* was not to be found, as appeareth by the discourse of Vigilius, who in the fourth book against Eutyches hath these words: 'Illa primitus uno diluens volumine quæ Leonis objiciuntur Epistolæ, cujus hoc sibi primo capitulum iste, nescio quis,

Scripture and the Greek Church is the *only-begotten*. It is then sufficient for the explication of these words, to shew how Christ is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his generation; that when others are also the sons of God, he alone should so be his Son, as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the *only-begotten*.

First, then, it cannot be denied that Christ is the Son of God, for that reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the Virgin Mary; *for that which is conceived* (or *begotten*[97]) *in her*, Matt. i. 20.

proposuit; *fidelium universitas profitetur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum.*' That which he aims at is the tenth Epistle of Leo, in which those words are found, but with the addition of *unicum*, which, as it seems, then was not there; as appears yet farther by the words which follow: '*Miror tamen quomodo hunc locum* iste notavit, et illum prætermisit, ubi unici filii commemorationem idem beatus Leo facit, dicens, *Idem vero sempiterni genitoris unigenitus sempiternus, natus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine;*' which words are not to be found in the same Epistle. Howsoever it was in the first copies of Leo; both Ruffinus and St. Augustin, who were before him, and Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, Etherius and Beatus, who were later, read it, *et in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum.* But the word used in the Scriptures, and kept constantly by the Greeks, is μονογενής, the *only-begotten*.

97 For the original is τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν· and it is the observation of St. Basil, οὐκ εἴρηται, τὸ κυηθὲν, ἀλλὰ, τὸ γεννηθέν. [vol. ii. p. 598 E.] Indeed the vulgar translation renders it, *quod in ea natum est*, and in St. Luke, *quod nascetur sanctum;* and it must be confessed this was the most ancient translation. For so Tertullian read it; '*Per virginem* dicitis natum, non ex virgine, et in vulva, non ex vulva, quia et Angelus in somnis ad Joseph, *Nam quod in ea natum est*, inquit, *de Spiritu Sancto est.*' *De Carne Christi, cap.* 20. [p. 322 C.] And of that in St. Luke, '*Hæc* et ab angelo exceperat secundum nostrum Evangelium, *Propterea, quod in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, filius Dei.*' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 418 A.] Yet *quod in ea natum est* cannot be proper, while it is yet in the womb; nor can the child first be said to be born, and then that the mother shall bring it forth. It is true, indeed, γεννᾶν signifies not always *to beget*, but sometimes *to bear* or *bring forth;* as ἡ γυνή σου Ἐλισάβετ γεννήσει υἱόν σοι, Luke i. 13. and ver. 57. Καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν. So τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεέμ, Matt. ii. 1. must necessarily be understood of Christ's nativity; for it is most certain, that he was not begotten or conceived at Bethlehem. And this without question must be the meaning of Herod's inquisition, Ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, *where the Messias was to be born.* But though γεννᾶν have sometime the signification of *bearing* or *bringing forth;* yet τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν cannot be so interpreted, because it speaks of something as past, when as yet Christ was not born; and though the conception was already past, and we translate it so, *which is conceived;* yet St. Basil rejects that interpretation; γεννᾶν is one thing, συλλαμβάνειν another. Seeing then the nativity was not yet come, and γεννηθέν speaks of something already past, therefore the old translation is not good, *quod in ea natum est.* Seeing, though the conception indeed were past, yet γεννᾶν signifieth not *to conceive*, and so is not properly to be interpreted, *that which is conceived;* seeing γεννᾶν is most properly *to beget*, as ἡ γεννητικὴ *the generative faculty:* therefore I conceive the fittest interpretation of those words, τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν, *that which is begotten in her.* And because the angel in St. Luke speaks of the same thing, therefore I interpret τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ, in the same manner, *that which is begotten of thee.*

by the testimony of an angel, *is of the Holy Ghost;* and because of him, therefore the Son of God. For so spake the angel to
106 the Virgin; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power* Luke i. 35.
of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee (or, *which is begotten of thee*) *shall be called the Son of God.* And the reason is clear, because that the Holy Ghost is God. For were he any creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the Virgin, he must have been the Son of a creature, not of God.

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ, thus born of the Virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an office by the special and immediate will of God, that by virtue thereof he must be acknowledged the *Son of God.* He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews; *Is it not written in your* John x. 34, *Law, I said, Ye are gods?* Are not these the very words of the 35, 36. eighty-second Psalm? *If he called them gods,* if God himself so spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called gods, *unto whom the word of God came,* (*and the Scripture cannot be broken,* nor the authority thereof in any particular denied,) *say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world,* whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary office, *say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

Thirdly, Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life. For *God hath fulfilled the promise unto us,* Acts xiii. *in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the* 33. *second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ, who is raised from thence, is, as it were, begotten to another life: and God, who raised him, is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are *the children of God, being the* Luke xx. *children of the resurrection.* Thus was he *defined* or *constituted,* 36. and *appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from* Rom. i. 4. *the dead;* neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, *the first-born from the dead.* Col. i. 18.

Fourthly, Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Father's house, and Lord of all the Spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. He is *set down at the right hand of* Heb. i. 3, 4, 5.

the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident, that Christ hath this fourfold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the *only-begotten Son*. For although to 107
be born of a Virgin be in itself miraculous, and justly entitles Christ unto [the name of] the Son of God; yet it is not so far above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the only-begotten.
Luke iii. 38. We read of Adam *the son of God*, as well as Seth the son of Adam: and surely the framing Christ out of a woman cannot so far transcend the making Adam out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance as we must believe between the first and second Adam. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth who did believe his doctrine, and did confess him to be the Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much less did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these ways by which Christ is represented to us as the Son of God, we shall find out one more yet, far more proper in itself, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confess him the only-begotten.

To which purpose I observe, that the actual possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin, as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same Christ was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgin's womb. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following method, as not only most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will

clearly prove out of the Holy Scriptures, that Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, had an actual being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's womb was not any created being, but essentially Divine. Thirdly, we will shew that the Divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the Divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son. Lastly, we will manifest that the Divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that Divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly *the only-begotten Son of the Father.*

As for the first, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin Mary, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven or went unto the Father, he had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these three suppositions not to be denied. First, that Christ did receive no other being or nature after his conception, before his ascension, than what was begotten of the Virgin. Secondly, that what was begotten of the Virgin had its first being here on earth, and therefore could not really be in heaven till he ascended thither. Thirdly, that what was really in heaven, really was; because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions certainly true, the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume; Jesus Christ was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the
08 Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven, or went unto the Father; as I shall particularly prove by the express words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin; and distinct from that being which

was conceived in her. Now that he was really in heaven before he ascended thither, appeareth by his own words to his disciples; John vi. 62. *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as spectators. The place to which that ascension tended was truly and really the heaven of heavens. The verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth, not a figurative but a real being, especially considering the opposition in the word *before*. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in heaven was *before*. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther shew that this ascension was the first; that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he speaks: and being in heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If Christ had ascended into heaven before his death, and descended from thence*, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the Gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the Evangelists ever make mention of it? Those which are so diligent in the description of his nativity and circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by Simeon, his adoration by the wise men; those which have described his descent into Egypt; would they have omitted his ascent into heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he shewed when he disputed with the doctors? and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent seeking of Joseph and Mary, and her words when they found Luke ii. 48. him, *Son, why hast thou dealt so with us?* shew that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended Luke ii. 51. into heaven. After that he went down to Nazareth, and *was subject to them:* and I understand not how he should ascend

θεωρῆτε· as it came to pass, βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη. Acts i. 9. ὅπου ἦν.

* [This remark is made in refutation of the extraordinary notion of the Socinians, that Jesus was taken up into heaven some time before his ministry began. In this way they explained John i. 18. iii. 13, &c. See Socinus, Op. vol. i. p. 146. ed. 1656. Schlichtingius, in Joan. iii. 13. Mosheim refuted it in a Dissertation, 'De raptu Christi in cœlos.']

into heaven, and at the same time be subject to them; or there receive his commission and instructions as the great legate of God, or ambassador from heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to John to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his inauguration. Immediately from Jordan he is carried into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and it were strange if any time could then be found for his ascension: for *he was forty days in the wilderness*, and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time *with the beasts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celestial hierarchy; and *tempted of Satan*, whose dominion reacheth no higher than the air. Wherefore in those forty days Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him; for *the angels ministered unto him.* After this *he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, and there exercised his prophetical office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory ascension of Christ is not only raised, without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in itself, and contrary to the revealed way of our redemption. For what reason should Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this only asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the sacerdotal office. For the holy of holies *made with hands* was the *figure of the true*, (that is, heaven itself,) into which the *High Priest alone went once every year:* and Christ as our High Priest *entered in once into the holy place.* If then they deny Christ was a Priest before he *preached the Gospel*, then did he not enter into heaven, because the High Priest alone went into the type thereof, the holy of holies. If they confess he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but once, and that not without blood. Wherefore being Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that

Mark i. 13.
Mark i. 13. Luke iv. 14.
Heb. ix. 24. Heb. ix. 7. Heb. ix. 12.

which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it: for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither.

John vi. 33. 51. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself: *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven;* and, *I am the living bread which came down from heaven.* He opposeth himself unto the manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven.

John vi. 32. or had its original from thence. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven,* but the Father gave Christ really from thence.

John vi. 38. Wherefore he saith, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the angels: but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather when any is opposed to Christ, the opposition is placed in this very origination. John the Bap-

Luke i. 15. tist was *filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;* born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God; and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this:

John iii. 31. *He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all.* Adam was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman: and yet he is so far from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from

1 Cor. xv. 47. the second Adam. For *the first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.* Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and

Eph. iv. 9. that antecedently to any ascent thither. For *that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first?* So St. Paul, asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of Christ as his first motion between heaven and earth*; and consequently, that the first being or existence which Christ had, was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His Disciples believed that he *came out from God:* and he com-

* [Pearson therefore understood εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς in Eph. iv. 9. to refer to Christ's coming upon earth, and not to his descent into the grave. See more in his remarks upon Art. V.]

mended that faith and confirmed the object of it by this assertion: *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* Thus having, by undoubted testimonies, made good the latter part of the argument, I may safely conclude, that being Christ was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any show of reason be denied, that Christ had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here. John xvi. 27, 28.

110 Secondly, we shall prove not only a bare priority of existence, but a preexistence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was man. This no man can deny, because all must confess the blessed Virgin was first saluted by the angel six months after Elizabeth conceived, and many hundred years after Abraham died. But Jesus Christ was really existent before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but Christ had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the express testimony of John himself; *This is he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.* In which words, first, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of Christ, *he that cometh after me:* for so he came after him into the womb, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptism; always after John, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, *he is preferred before me,* as appeareth by the reiteration of these words: *He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.* The addition of which expression of his own unworthiness sheweth, that *to be preferred before him** is the same with being *worthier than he;* to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three Evangelists. Thirdly, he rendereth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to Christ, saying *for,* or rather, *because, he was* John i. 15. John i. 27.

* [It will be observed that *he is preferred before me* is in the Greek ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν; but *he was before me,* in ver. 30. is πρῶτός μου ἦν.]

before me. And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of itself, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration (as the very tense, *he was before me*, sufficiently signifieth), and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if John the Baptist had thus spoke at large: "This man Christ Jesus, who came into the world, and entered on his prophetical office six months after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity than I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge myself unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me."

Now as Christ was before John, which speaks a small, so was he also before Abraham, which speaks a larger time. Jesus himself hath asserted this preexistence to the Jews; *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.* Which words, plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For, first, Abraham in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification than such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy, spake of the same person. Beside, Abraham must be the subject of that proposition, *Abraham was;* because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if Abraham be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate *Abraham was,* in a tense signifying the time past, so it is most certainly to be understood; because that which he speaks unto, is the preexistence of Abraham, and that of long duration; so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition, had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression, *I am*, seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth, yet the use[98] of it sufficiently main-

John viii. 58.

[98] So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly than usual, [viii. 187]:

Ἀβρὰμ πρὶν γένος ἔσχεν, ἐγὼ πέλον——

So St. John xiv. 9. Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με; Have I been *so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me?* And St. John xv. 27. Ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε, *because ye*

111 taineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. And then the words will plainly signify thus much: "Do you question how I could see Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before ever Abraham, the person whom you speak of, was born[99], I had a real being and existence (by which I was capable of the sight of him), in which I have continued until now." In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviour's answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous; and therefore *they took up stones to cast at him.*

This literal and plain explication is yet farther necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition of the *light of the world,* which there can be no show of reason to admit[1];) whether they interpret the former

have been (or *continued*) *with me from the beginning.* Thus Nonnus, [xv. 111]:

Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγαῶτες ὅλον θηήτορες ἔργων.

St. John vi. 24. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ, *When the people saw that Jesus* was *not there.* Nor only doth St. John use thus the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, so on the contrary, ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, St. John vii. 33. and ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται, St. John xii. 26. xiv. 3. xvii. 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (John vii. 34.) we read, ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, or ὅπου εἶμι. For Nonnus seems to have read it εἶμι by his translation, [vii. 130.]

——εἰς ἀτραπὸν ἣν περ ὁδεύσω·

and the Jews' question, Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι; shews they understood it so: for this εἶμι, though of a present form, is of a future signification. *Hesych.* Εἶμι, πορεύσομαι. And so it agreeth with that which follows, St. John viii. 21. Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν. If we read εἰμί, as the old translation, *ubi ego sum,* it will have the force of ἔσομαι, and agree with the other, Ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. Howsoever it is clear, St. John useth the present εἰμί either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our consideration can admit no other relation but to the time already past, in which Abraham lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joined with the aorist elsewhere: as Psal. xc. 2. Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι, καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ. What can be more parallel than, Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι, to πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, and σὺ εἶ, to ἐγώ εἰμι? in the same manner, though by another word, Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἑδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με. Prov. viii. 25.

99 So the Æthiopic version, *Amen dico vobis, priusquam Abraham nasceretur, fui ego;* and the Persian, *Vere, vere vobis dico, quod nondum Abraham factus erat, cum ego eram.*

1 This is the shift of the Socinians, who make this speech of Christ elliptical, and then supply it from the twelfth verse, *I am the light of the world.* 'Quod vero ea verba, *Ego sum,* sint ad eum

part (*Before Abraham was*) of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter (*I am*) of a preexistence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent Christ with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all; and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak: "Do ye so much wonder how I should *have seen Abraham*, who am *not yet fifty years old?* Do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration (*Verily, verily, I say unto you*), Before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, *the father of many nations*, before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am*. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnify myself: for what I speak is as true of you, as it is of me; before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I *have seen Abraham*." The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. "Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? Do ye look upon my age, and ask, *Hast thou seen Abraham?* I confess it is more than eighteen hundred years since that Patri- 112
arch died, and less than forty since I was born at Bethlehem: but look not on this computation; for before Abraham was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnify myself in this, for ye were so." How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfac-

modum supplenda, ac si ipse subjecisset iis, *Ego sum lux mundi*, superius e principio ejus orationis, ver. 12. et hinc quod Christus bis seipsum iisdem, *Ego sum*, lucem mundi vocaverit, ver. 24 et 28.—deprehendi potest.' *Catech. Racov.* [de Cognitione Dei, c. i. p. 44.] Whereas there is no ground for any such connexion. That discourse of the light of the world was in the treasury, ver. 20; that which followeth was not, at least appeareth not to be so. Therefore the ellipsis of the 24th and 28th verses is not to be supplied by the 12th, but the 24th from the 23d, Ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθέν εἰμι, and the 28th either from the same, or that which is most general, his office, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός. Again, verse 31, it is very probable that a new discourse is again begun, and therefore if there were an ellipsis in the words alleged, it would have no relation to either of the former supplies, or if to either, to the latter; but indeed it hath to neither.

tion to the question, or the least occasion of the Jews' exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews; being those strained explications render the words of Christ not only impertinent to the occasion, but vain and useless to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably uncapable of any such interpretations: we must adhere unto that literal sense already delivered, by which it appeareth Christ had a being, as before John, so also before Abraham (not only before Abram became Abraham, but before Abraham was Abram), and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the Virgin.

Thirdly, we shall extend this preexistence to a far longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But Christ was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood, is evident by the words of St. Peter, who saith, that Christ was *put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing**.) From which words it appeareth, that Christ preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit was not his soul, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that Christ did preach unto those persons which in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time *the longsuffering of God waited*, and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those,

1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20.

Ἀπειθήσασί ποτε, ὅτε ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε.

* [Another interpretation of this text is considered in Art. V. *He descended into Hell.*]

against whom I bring this argument, deny it not. It followeth therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of Christ, did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand St. Peter of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom St. Peter speaks were disobedient in the days of Noah. But none of those to whom the Apostles preached were ever disobedient in the days of Noah. Therefore none of those to which the Apostles preached, were any of those of which St. Peter speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet[2], by the send- 113
2 Pet. ii. 5. ing of Noah, *the eighth Preacher of righteousness*[3]: yet to do any

2 'Prophetæ ab ipso habentes donum in illum prophetaverunt.' *Barnabæ Epist.* [Vet. Int. c. 5. p. 60.]

3 I have thus translated this place of St. Peter, because it may add some advantage to the argument: for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son: and so by this we have gained the preexistence of another 1000 years. However those words, Ἀλλ' ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξε, may be better interpreted than they are, when we translate them, *but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness.* For, first, if we look upon the Greek phrase, ὄγδοος Νῶε may be, not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more; in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect to the rest, but only consignifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the *Supplices* of Æschylus, ver. 715.

Τὸ γὰρ τεκόντων σέβας
Τρίτον τόδ' ἐν θεσμοῖς
Δίκας γέγραπται μεγιστοτίμου,

we must not understand it, as if honour due to parents were the third commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable laws left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius, Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίοις νομοθετῆσαι, καὶ τῶν νόμων αὐτοῦ τρεῖς ἔτι Ξενοκράτης ὁ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσῖνι τούσδε· Γονεῖς τιμᾶν· Θεοὺς καρποῖς ἀγάλλειν· Ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. *De Abstinent. lib.* iv. [§. 22.] Which words are thus translated by St. Jerom, who hath made use of most part of that fourth book of Porphyrius: '*Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienses tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleusinæ residere scribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non rescendum.*' *Adv. Jovinian. lib.* ii. [§. 14. vol. ii. p. 344 B.] Where we see honour due to parents the first precept, though by Æschylus called the third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus the Orator, Καὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεὰς αἷς ἐκεῖνος ἱεροποιὸς καταστὰς δέκατος αὐτός. From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that office, so that nine were neces-

thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

The second part of the argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son, by whom *in these last days God spake unto us*, is he, *by whom also he made the worlds.* So that as *through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God*, so must we also believe that they were made by the Son of God[4]. Which the Apostle doth not only in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequel prove. For shewing greater things have been spoken of him than ever were attributed to any of the angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; amongst the rest, he saith, the Scripture spake *unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And* not only so, but also, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Now whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creator of the world. For he must be acknowledged the Maker of the earth, who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens, who can say they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself

Heb. i. 2.

Heb. xi. 3.

Heb. i. 8, 10, 11, 12.

sarily before or above him, and many more might be after or below him: but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten ἱεροποιοί waiting on the Σεμναὶ θεαί, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attic writers, especially Thucydides. And so we may understand St. Peter, that God preserved Noah (a preacher of righteousness) with seven more, of which he deserveth to be named the first, rather than the last or eighth. But, secondly, the ordinal ὄγδοον may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, *Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness.* For we read at the birth of Enos, that *men began to call upon the name of the Lord*, Gen. iv. 26. which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person: as the LXX. Οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the vulgar Latin, *Iste cœpit invocare nomen Domini.* The Jews have a tradition, that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the days of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a preacher or prophet, and so the rest that followed him; and then Noah is the eighth.

4 It being in both places expressed in the same phrase by the same author, Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, Heb. i. 2. Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ. xi. 3.

acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour Christ. Nay, the conjunction *and* refers this place of the Psalmist plainly to the former [5], of which he had said expressly, *but unto the Son he saith.* As sure then as *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,* was said unto the Son: so certain it is, *Thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth,* was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostle's 114
connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the Apostle produced the Scripture to shew that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withal acknowledge that he created them: whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creator, must also deny him to be understood as the destroyer. Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of and to our Saviour (or else the Apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the spirit of St. Paul mistook the spirit of David); being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; being the literal exposition is so clear, that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphorical: it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist, and the interpretation of an Apostle, that the Son of God created the world. Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testify as much, but only that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they which deny this truth of the creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two ways to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation,

[5] The answer of Socinus to this conjunction is very weak, relying only upon the want of a comma after καί in the Greek, and *et* in the Latin. And whereas it is evident that there are distinctions in the Latin and Greek copies after that conjunction, he flies to the ancientest copies, which all men know were most careless of distinctions, and urgeth that there is no addition of *rursum* or the like after *et*, whereas in the Syriac translation we find expressly that addition, וחוב.

then they endeavour to shew that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressly of our Saviour Christ, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the creation attributed unto him appear to be merely metaphorical. The place before alleged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the creation or real production of the world, that they never denied it: and I have so manifestly shewed it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gainsaying.

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged real unto Christ*, we shall the easier persuade that likewise to be such, which is pretended to be metaphorical. In the Epistle to the Colossians we read of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption through his blood;* and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other than Jesus Christ. He therefore it must be, who was thus described by the Apostle; *who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In which words our Saviour is expressly styled the *first-born of every creature*[6], that is, begotten by God, as the *Son of his love*[7], antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation, was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of Moses, as most consonant to his description; *for by him were all things created*

Col. i. 14.

Col. i. 15, 16, 17.

6 *The first-born of every creature* is taken by Origen for an expression declaring the Divinity of Christ, and used by him as a phrase in opposition to his humanity to express the same. Ἐλέγομεν δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω, ὅτι αἱ μέν τινες εἰσὶ φωναὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως, ὡς ἡ, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ αἱ τούτοις παραπλήσιαι· αἱ δὲ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν νοουμένου ἀνθρώπου, ὡς ἡ τοῦ, Νῦν δέ με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι, ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα. *Lib.* ii. *cont. Cels.* [§. 25. p. 409 F.]

7 In relation to the precedent words, Τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, for that υἱὸς ἀγαπητὸς was the υἱὸς πρωτότοκος.

* [" Having asserted unto Christ" means "having asserted it to belong to "Christ."]

that are in heaven, and that are in earth; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation. Secondly, by a division which Moses never used, as describing the production only of corporeal 115
substances: lest therefore those immaterial beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted in Moses his description, he addeth *visible and invisible;* and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, *whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers,* and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his person, and the authority of his action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumental cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the final as the efficient cause; for *all things were created by him and for him.* Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by virtue of God's
Acts xvii. 28. conservation, in whom *we live, and move, and have our being;* lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Conserver, as well as the Creator; for *he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most complete description of the Creator of the world; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his majesty, who is nowhere more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were sufficient to persuade us to interpret this place of the making of the world, yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compel us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literal, the other metaphorical; one old, the other new; one by way of formation,
2 Cor. v. 17. the other by way of reformation. *If any man be in Christ, he is*
Gal. vi. 15; v. 6. *a new creature,* saith St. Paul, and again, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.* Instead of which words he had before, *faith working*
Eph. ii. 10. *by love. For we are the workmanship* of God, *created in Christ*

Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. From whence it is evident, that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in. And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to *the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts:* Eph. iv. from whence the Apostle chargeth us to be *renewed in the spirit* 22, 23, 24. *of our mind,* and to *put on that new man, which after God is* Col. iii. 10. *created in righteousness and true holiness;* and *which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.* The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in renovation[8], or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a real change, though not substantial, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation.

116 Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the place produced out of the Epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of creation mentioned in the Scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the Apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new creation, as will thus appear: The object of the creation, mentioned in this place, is of as great latitude and universality as the object of the first creation, not only expressed, but implied, by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new creation, it neces-

8 Ἀνανέωσις or ἀνακαίνωσις· as, *the new man,* νέος ἄνθρωπος, or καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. The first, ὁ ἀνανεούμενος, the last, ὁ ἀνακαινούμενος, both the same. Suidas, Ἀνακαίνισις, ἡ ἀνανέωσις· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀνακαίνωσις· which is the language of the New Testament. This renovation being thus called καινὴ κτίσις, the ancients framed a proper word for it, which is, Ἀνάκτισις· ἐν ᾗ γίνεται πάντων τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα κακῶν ἡ ἀναίρεσις. *S. Justin. Mart. Quæst. et Resp. ad Græcos.* [p. 513 A.] This new creation doth so necessarily infer an alteration, that it is called by St. Paul a metamorphosis; Μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν. Rom. xii. 2.

sarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is always opposed to the old; and if Adam had continued still in innocency, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old and new creation. Being then all men become not new, being there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love, being so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by *Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven, and that are in earth,* when the greatest part of mankind have no share in the new creation. Again, we cannot imagine that the Apostle should speak of the creation in a general word, intending thereby only the new, and while he doth so, express particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it. The angels are all either good or bad: but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did Christ come to redeem the devils; or whether they be good, they were always such, nor were they so by the virtue of Christ's incarnation, for *he took not on him the nature of angels.*
Heb. ii. 16. We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, because an old man becomes a new; but there is no such notion in the celestial hierarchy, because no old and new angels: they which fell, are fallen for eternity; they which stand, always stood, and shall stand for ever. Where then are the regenerated *thrones and dominions?* Where are the recreated *principalities and powers?* All those angels of whatsoever degrees were created by the Son of God, as the Apostle expressly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation *unto true holiness and righteousness,* because they always were truly righteous and holy ever since their first creation. Therefore except we could yet invent another creation, which were neither the old nor the new, we must conclude, that all the angels were at first created by the Son of God; and as they, so all things else, especially man, whose creation all the first writers of the Church of God expressly attribute unto the Son[9], asserting that those
Gen. i. 26. words, *Let us make man,* were spoken as by the Father unto him.

[9] 'Ad hoc Dominus sustinuit pati pro anima nostra, cum sit orbis terrarum Dominus, cui dixit die ante constitutionem seculi, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.*' *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 5. [Vet. Int. p. 60.] And again, Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ περὶ ἡμῶν ὡς λέγει τῷ Υἱῷ, Ποιήσωμεν κατ' εἰκονα,

Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the doctrine arising from it, seeing it is so clearly delivered by St. John: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Whereas we have proved Christ had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, because he was at the beginning of the world; and have also proved that he was at the beginning of the world, because he made it; this place of St. John gives a sufficient testimony to the truth of both the last together. *In the beginning was the Word;* and that
117 Word made flesh is Christ; therefore Christ was in the beginning. *All things were made by him:* therefore he created the world. Indeed nothing can be more clearly penned, to give full satisfaction in this point, than these words of St. John, which seem with a strange brevity designed to take off all objections, and remove all prejudice, before they teach so strange a truth. Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, and his age was known to them for whom this Gospel was penned. St. John would teach that this Christ did make the world, which was created at least four thousand years before his birth: the name of Jesus was given him since at his circumcision; the title of Christ belonged unto his office, which he exercised not till thirty years after. Neither of these with any show of probability will reach to the creation of the world. Wherefore he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the Jews, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so. Unto that name he shews at first that he had a being in the beginning[10]; when all things were to be created, and consequently were not yet, then *in the beginning was the Word*, and so not created. This is the first step, the Word was not created when the world was made. The next is, that the same Word which then was,

John i. 1, 2, 3.

&c. *cap.* 6. Ἐγκαλοῦμεν οὖν Ἰουδαίοις τοῦτον μὴ νομίσασι Θεὸν ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν πολλαχοῦ μεμαρτυρημένον ὡς μεγάλην ὄντα δύναμιν καὶ Θεὸν, κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα· τούτῳ γὰρ φαμὲν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Μωσέα κοσμοποιΐᾳ προστάττοντα τὸν Πατέρα εἰρηκέναι τὸ, Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ, Γενηθήτω στερέωμα, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, ὅσα προσέταξεν ὁ Θεὸς γενέσθαι· καὶ τούτῳ εἰρηκέναι τὸ, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [§. 9. p. 393 B.]

10 Ἐν ἀρχῇ, the first word of Moses; whence the Syriac translation, בּרישׁית. So Solomon, מראשׁ מקדמי־ארץ Ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι. Prov. viii. 23. 'In principio erat Sermo; in quo principio scilicet Deus fecit cœlum et terram.' *Tertul. adv. Hermog. cap.* 20. [p. 240 D.]

and was not made, at the same time, *was with God*[11], when he made all things: and therefore well may we conceive it was
Gen. i. 26. he to whom *God said, Let us make man in our image, after our*
Gen. iii. 22. *likeness;* and of whom those words may be understood, *Behold, the man is become as one of us.* After this, lest any should conceive the creation of the world too great and divine a work to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object, that none can produce any thing out of nothing but God himself; he addeth, that the *Word,* as he *was with God,* so *was* he also *God.* Again, lest any should divide the Deity, or frame a false conception of different Gods, he returns unto the second assertion, and joins it with the first, *The same was in the beginning with God:* and then delivers that which at the first seemed strange, but now, after those three propositions, may easily be accepted; *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* For now this is no new doctrine, but only an interpretation of those Scriptures which told us, God made all things
Gen. i. 3. by his word before. For *God said, Let there be light; and*
Ps. xxxiii. 6. *there was light.* And so, *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.*
Heb. xi. 3. From whence *we understand that the worlds were framed by the*
2 Pet. iii. 5. *word of God.* Neither was it a new interpretation, but that which was most familiar to the Jews, who in their synagogues, by the reading of the paraphrase[12] or the interpretation of the

11 Πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, that is, παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, that is, *by God.* As Nonnus, [i. 4.]

Πατρὸς ἔην ἀμέριστος, ἀτέρμονι σύνθρονος ἥδρη.

As Wisdom speaketh, Prov. viii. 30. *Then I was by him,* ואהיה אצלו ἤμην παρ' αὐτῷ. *Chald.* והוית בצדוי *et eram in latere ejus,* Moschopulus, Περὶ σχεδῶν. Πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, τουτέστι, μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. As Matth. xiii. 56. Αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσί; Mar. xiv. 49. Καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 1 Cor. xvi. 6. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμενῶ. Πεπιστευμένον διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ Πατρὶ ἦν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη. *S. Ignat. ad Magnes.* [§. 6. p. 19.]

12 I conceive this Chaldee Paraphrase to represent the sense of the Jews of that age, as being their public interpretation of the Scripture. Wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and general opinion of that nation. Now it is certain that this paraphrast doth often use מימרא דיי *the word of God,* for יהוה *God* himself, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As Isa. xlv. 12. אנכי עשיתי ארץ ואדם עליה בראתי *I made the earth, and created man upon it, saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel;* which the Chaldee translateth אנא במימרי עבדית ארעא [ואנשא עלה בריתי] *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it.* In the same manner, Jer. xxvii. 5. *I made the earth, and men and beasts on the face of the earth;* the Targum אנא במימרי עבדית ית ארעא. And Isa. xlviii. 13. אף־ידי יסדה ארץ *My hand also founded the earth:* the Chaldee אף במימרי שכללית ארעא *Etiam in verbo meo fundavi terram.* And most clearly Gen. i. 27, we read, *Et creavit Deus hominem:* the Jerusalem Targum, *Verbum Domini creavit hominem.* And Gen.

Hebrew text in the Chaldee language, were constantly taught, that the Word of God was the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made. Which undoubtedly was the cause
118 why St. John delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood

iii. 8. *Audierunt vocem Domini Dei:* the Chaldee Paraphrase ושמעו יה־קל מימרא דיי אלהים *Et audierunt vocem verbi Domini Dei.* Now this which the Chaldee Paraphrase called מימרא the Hellenists named Λόγον· as appeareth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before St. John, and reckons in his Divinity, first, Πατέρα τῶν ὅλων, then δεύτερον Θεὸν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος. *Quæst. et Solut.* [Fragm. i. vol. ii. p. 625.] Whom he calls Ὀρθὸν Θεοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *De Agricult.* [vol. i. p. 308.] He attributes the creation of the world to this Λόγος, whom he terms Ὄργανον Θεοῦ, δ' οὗ (ὁ κόσμος) κατεσκεύασται. *De Flammeo Gladio.* [p. 162.] Σκιὰ δὲ Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει. *Idem, Allegor. lib.* ii. [lib. iii. vol. i. p. 106.] Where we must observe, though Philo makes the Λόγος, of whom he speaks, as instrumental in the creation of the world; yet he taketh it not for a bare expression of the will of God, but for a God, though in the second degree, and expressly for the Son of God. Nor ought we to look on Philo Judæus in this as a Platonist, but merely as a Jew, who refers his whole doctrine of this Λόγος to the first chapter of Genesis. And the rest of the Jews before him, who had no such knowledge out of Plato's school, used the same notion. For as Isa. xlviii. 13. the *hand of God* is by the Chaldee Paraphrast translated the *Word of God:* so in the book of Wisdom, Ἡ παντοδύναμός σου χεὶρ καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον, Sap. xi. 17. is changed into ὁ παντοδύναμός σου Λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, xviii. 15. and Siracides xliii. 26. ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ σύγκειται πάντα. Nay, the Septuagint* hath changed *Shaddai*, the undoubted name of the omnipotent God, into Λόγος *the Word*, Ezek. i. 24. נקול־שדי *quasi vox sublimis Dei*, quod Hebraice appellatur שדי et juxta LXX. φωνὴ τοῦ λόγου, id est, *vox verbi*, ut universa quæ prædicantur in mundo vocem Filii Dei esse dicamus.' *S. Hieron.* [Comm. in Ezek. vol. v. p. 20 B.] And therefore Celsus, writing in the person of a Jew, acknowledgeth that the Word is the Son of God. Εἴ γε ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶν ὑμῖν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπαινοῦμεν. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [§. 31. vol. i. p. 413 C.] And although Origen object that in this Celsus makes the Jew speak improperly, because the Jews which he had conversed with did never acknowledge that the Son of God was the Word; yet Celsus his Jew did speak the language of Philo: but between the time of Celsus and that of Origen, (I guess about threescore years,) the Jews had learnt to deny that notion of Λόγος, that they might with more colour reject St. John. If then all the Jews, both they which understood the Chaldee exposition, and those which only used the Greek translation, had such a notion of the Word of God; if all things by their confession were made by the Word; we have no reason to believe St. John should make use of any other notion than what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be so easily understood.†

* [In the Alexandrian MS. but not in the Vatican.]

† [Other persons have contended, that the Christian writers did not borrow their use of the term *Logos* from the Chaldee Paraphrasts. Writers on both sides of the question are referred to in Wolf's *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, vol. ii. p. 1186-1189. Though it is true that the later Platonists and the Alexandrian Jews had taken to speak of the *Word of God*, as a distinct Being, yet if all the passages in Philo are examined, it will be seen that he did not really understand by the *Logos* a distinctly existing Being, i. e. a person, but merely an attribute of God. St. John may have borrowed the term *Logos* from the Platonists or the Gnostics, but his object was to shew that the Logos of the Christians was totally different from the Platonic Logos.]

him. Only that which as yet they knew not, was, that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was Jesus Christ. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in itself, so consonant to the notion of the Word, and the apprehension of the Jews; it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth, a weak, useless, false discourse. For who will grant that *in the beginning* must be
1 John i. 1. the same with that in St. John's Epistle, *from the beginning*, especially when the very interpretation involves in itself a contradiction? For *the beginning* in St. John's Epistle is that in which the Apostle saw, and heard, and touched the Word: *the beginning* in his Gospel was that in which *the Word was with God*, that is, not seen nor heard by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostle's assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist
John i. 31. taught as much; who therefore *came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel?* when we are sure that St. Matthew and St. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more than this, that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if *the beginning* be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but only potentially or by designation. Secondly, it is a strange figurative speech, *the Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, especially in this Apostle's method. *In the beginning was the Word;* there *was* must signify an actual existence; and if so, why in the next sentence (*the Word was with God*) shall the same verb signify an objective being only? Certainly though to be in the beginning be one thing, and to be with God, another; yet *to be* in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this *being* understood of the knowledge of God, why we

should grant that thereby is signified, he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of itself is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle *only* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For
119 except Gabriel be God, who came to the Virgin; except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the shepherds be God; except Zachary and Elizabeth, except Simeon and Anna, except Joseph and Mary be God; it cannot be true that he was known to God only, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to pass by the third attribute, *and the Word was God*, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the Apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, *the same was in the beginning with God*, and immediately subjoined those words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made;* how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the latter part of the Apostles, who after the ascension of our Saviour did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered to do by Christ, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former of all which Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new expositors: for while John the Baptist only preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of St. John, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of argument, as the Apostle antecedently by the method of nature, that in the beginning Christ was. He then who was in heaven and

descended from thence, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither, he who was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and existence before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary. But all these we have already shewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge, that Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: which is our first assertion, properly opposed to the Photinians[13].

13 The Photinians were heretics, so called from Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallogræcia, and scholar to Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra. 'Photinus de Gallogræcia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii Episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis hæresin instaurare conatus est.' *S. Hieron. Catal. Eccles.* [c. 107. vol. ii. p. 923.] 'Photinus Sirmiensis Episcopus fuit a Marcello imbutus. Nam et Diaconus sub eo aliquandiu fuit.' *S. Hilar. Frag.* [II. 19. p. 1295 D.] Wherefore when Epiphanius speaketh thus of him, Οὗτος ὡρμᾶτο ἀπὸ Σιρμίου, it hath no relation to the original of his person, but his heresy; of which St. Hilary, 'Pestifere, natum Jesum Christum ex Maria, Pannonia defendit.' *De Trin.* [VII. 3. p. 916 E.] He was a man of singular parts and abilities, Φύσεως ἔχων εὖ λέγειν, καὶ πείθειν ἱκανός, says Sozomen, *lib.* iv. *cap.* 6. [p. 135.] Γέγονε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Φωτεινὸς λάλος τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὠξυμμένος τὴν γλῶτταν, πολλοὺς δὲ δυνάμενος ἀπατᾶν τῇ τοῦ λόγου προφορᾷ καὶ ἑτοιμολογίᾳ. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* 71. [vol. i. §. 1. p. 829 B.] 'Erat et ingenii viribus valens, et doctrinæ opibus excellens, et eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque sermone copiose et graviter disputaret et scriberet.' *Vincent. Lirin. adv. Hæres. cap.* 16. [p. 241 C.] He is said by some to follow the heresy of Ebion. 'Hebionis hæresin instaurare conatus est,' says St. Jerome; and St. Hilary ordinarily understands him by the name of Hebion, and sometimes expounds himself, 'Hebion, qui est Photinus.' [*De Trin.* VII. 3. p. 916. c. 7. p. 919 D.] But there is no similitude in their doctrines, Hebion being more Jew than Christian, and teaching Christ as much begotten by Joseph, as born of Mary. Philaster will have him agree wholly with Paulus Samosatenus 'in omnibus.' Epiphanius with an ἀπὸ μέρους, and ἐπέκεινα. Socrates and Sozomen, with him and with Sabellius: whereas he differed much from them both, especially from Sabellius, as being far from a Patripassian. 'Marcellus Sabellianæ hæresis assertor extiterat: Photinus vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, a Sabellio quidem in unione dissentiens, sed initium Christi ex Maria prædicabat.' *Sever. Hist. Sacr.* [lib. ii. c. 37. vol. ii. p. 201.] Wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of antiquity what did properly belong unto Photinus, because I think it not yet done, and we find his heresy, in the propriety of it, to begin and spread again. 'Photinus mentis cæcitate deceptus in Christo verum et substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante omnia sæcula genitum esse non credidit.' *Leo de Nativ. Christi, Serm.* IV. [vol. i. p. 155.] 'Etiam Photinus hominem tantum profitetur Dei Filium; dicit illum non fuisse ante beatam Mariam.' *Lucifer Calarit.* [*De non parcendo in Deum delinq.* p. 203.] 'Si quis in Christo sic veritatem prædicat animæ et carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere Deitatis, id est, qui sic dicit Christum hominem, ut Deum neget, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed Photinianus Hæreticus.' *Fulgent. ad Donat.* [c. xvi. p. 206.] Φωτεινὸς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγει τὸν γεγεννημένον, Θεοῦ μὴ λέγων εἶναι τὸν τόκον, καὶ τὸν ἐκ μήτρας προελθόντα, ἄνθρωπον ὑποτίθεται διῃρημένον Θεοῦ. *Theodot. Homil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil. p.* 3. *cap.* 10. [Mansi, v. p. 205 E.] 'Anathematizamus Photinum, qui He-

120 The second assertion, next to be made good, is, that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was

bionis hæresim instaurans, Dominum Jesum Christum tantum ex Maria Virgine confitetur.' *Damas. Profess. Fidei.* [Ep. iii. p. 326 B.] *Φάσκει δὲ οὗτος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸν Χριστὸν μὴ εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας καὶ δεῦρο αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, ἐξότε, φησὶ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπῆλθεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐγεννήθη ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. S. Epiph. Hæres.* 71. [vol. i. p. 829 A.] *Ἔλεγε δὲ ὡς Θεὸς μέν ἐστι παντοκράτωρ εἷς, ὁ τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας· τὴν δὲ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων γέννησίν τε καὶ ὕπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐ προσίετο, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαρίας γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰσηγεῖτο. Sozomen. lib.* iv. *cap.* 6. [p. 135.] 'Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse et solitarium, et more Judaico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium asserit, cui principium adscribit ex Maria; et hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solam nos personam Dei Patris, et solum Christum hominem colere debere.' *Vincent. Lirin. adv. Hæres. cap.* 17. [p. 241 E.] In the disputation framed by Vigilius out of the seventh book of St. Hilary, as I conceive, Photinus rejecting the opinion of Sabellius (whom Socrates and Sozomen said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own: 'Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Maria Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum atque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, a Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus et eximio Divinitatis honore donatus.' [Dial. I. iv. p. 122.] And again, 'Ego Domino nostro Jesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, et per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum.' [c. x. p. 128.] *Vide eundem, lib.* ii. *adv. Eutych.* 'Ignorat etiam Photinus *magnum pietatis, sacramentum,* qui Christi ex Virgine fatetur exordium—Et propterea non credit sine initio substantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confitetur ex Virgine.' *Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib.* i. [c. 6. p. 74.] Gregory Nazianzen, according to his custom, gives a very brief, but remarkable expression; *Φωτεινοῦ τὸν κάτω Χριστὸν καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἀρχόμενον. Orat.* 26. [Orat. xxxiii. 16. p. 614 D.] But the opinion of Photinus cannot be better understood than by the condemnation of it in the Council of Sirmium; which having set out the confession of their faith in brief, addeth many and various anathemas, according to the several heresies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus. 'Si quis secundum præscientiam vel prædestinationem a Maria dicit filium esse, et non ante sæcula ex Patre natum, apud Deum esse, et per eum facta esse omnia, anathema sit.' [Mansi iii. p. 259 D.] The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth also were particulars directed against him, as St. Hilary hath observed: but the last of all is most material. 'Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante sæcula subsistentem, et ministrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem, non dicat, sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo et Christum et Filium nominatum esse, et initium accepisse ut sit Deus, dicat, anathema sit.' [p. 260 E.] Upon which the observation of St. Hilary is this: 'Concludi damnatio ejus hæresis, propter quam conventum erat, (that is, the Photinian,) expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur, oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur.' *S. Hilar. de Syn. cont. Arianos.* [c. 61. p. 1185 D.] Thus was Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, condemned by a Council held in the same city. They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arians, Semi-Arians, and Catholics; *Καθεῖλον εὐθύς,* says Socrates, *καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ὡς καλῶς καὶ δικαίως γενόμενον, πάντες ἐπήνεσαν καὶ τότε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα. lib.* ii. *cap.* 29. [p. 124.] And because his history is very obscure and intricate, take this brief catalogue of his condemnations. We read that he was condemned at the Council of Nice, and at the same time by a Council at Rome under Sylvester: but this is delivered only in a forged *Epilogus Concilii Romani.* He was then first condemned with Marcellus his

not any created, but the Divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God; from whence we inferred his preexistence, *in the beginning*, assuring us as
Heb. iii. 4. much that he was God, as that he was. *For he that built all things was God.* And the same Apostle which assures us, *All things were made by him*, at the same time tells us, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Where *in the beginning* must not be denied unto the third proposition, because it cannot be denied unto the second.
Prov. viii. 23. Therefore *in the beginning, or ever the earth was, the Word was God*, the same God with whom he was. For we cannot with any show of reason either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be no more supreme Gods than one; or conceive that the Apostle should speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third proposition: in the second, of a God eternal and independent, in the third, of a made and depending God[14]. Especially, first considering

master, as Sulpitius Severus relates, probably by the synod at Constantinople; for in that Marcellus was deprived. *Sozomen. lib.* ii. *cap.* 33. [p. 91.] *Socrat. lib.* i. *cap.* 36. [p. 72.] Secondly, his heresy is renounced in the second synod at Antioch. *Athanas. de Syn.* [§. 5, 6. vol. i. p. 740.] *Socrat. lib.* ii. *cap.* 19. Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of Sardes. *S. Epiphan. et Sulpit. Sever.* Fourthly, by a council at Milan. *S. Hilar. Frag.* [II. xix. p. 1296 A.] Fifthly, in a synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed. *S. Hilar. Frag.* [II. xxi. p. 1299 A.] Sixthly, he was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern bishops, and being convicted by Basil Bishop of Aneyra, was banished from thence. *S. Hilar. S. Epiph. Socrat. Sozomen. Vigil.* Indeed he was so generally condemned not only then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as St. Jerome testifies, and the Synodic Epistle of the Aquileian Council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. - Ἤδη γὰρ καὶ διεσκεδάσθη εἰς ὀλίγον χρόνον ἡ τούτου τοῦ ἠπατημένου αἵρεσις, says Epiphanius, who lived not long after him. [Hæres. lxxi. §. 6. vol. i. p. 833 C.] So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the heretic, who railed at St. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though in a mean translation) delivered by Facundus. 'Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, et proximus salvare, bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere, quem credidisti Deum.' *Facund. ad Justinian. lib.* iv. [c. 2. Galland. xi. p. 706 B.]

14 And that upon so poor a ground as the want of an article, because in the first place it is ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, in the second, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, not ὁ Θεός· from hence to conclude, ὁ Θεός is one God, that is, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the supreme God; Θεός another, not the supreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholden to Epiphanius for this observation, whose words are these: Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Θεὸς, ἄνευ τοῦ ἄρθρου, τὸν τυχόντα εἴπαμεν Θεὸν τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἢ Θεὸν τὸν ὄντα (or rather οὐκ ὄντα)· ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, ὁ Θεὸς, δῆλον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ἄρθρου τὸν ὄντα σημαίνομεν, ἀληθῆ τε καὶ γινωσκόμενον. *Samarit. Hæres.* [§. 4. vol. i.

that the eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called
121 the Word, the only reason which we can conceive why the

p. 27 A.] But whosoever shall apply this rule to the sacred Scriptures will find it most fallacious. *In the beginning* ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, undoubtedly belongs to the true and supreme God: but it does not thence follow, that πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος should be understood of the Spirit of another or inferior God. Certainly St. John, when he speaks of the Baptist, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, meant, he had his commission from heaven; and when it is spoken of Christ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, and again, ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, it must be understood of the true God the Father. In the like manner, Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε, if it were taken τυχόντως of any ever called God, nay, even of Christ Jesus as man, it were certainly false. How can then any deny the Word to be the supreme God, because he is called simply Θεός, when St. John in the four next places, in which he speaketh of the supreme God, mentioneth him without an article? This criticism of theirs was first the observation of Asterius the Arian; Οὐκ εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν, ἢ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δίχα τῆς προσθήκης, δύναμιν Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν· ἄλλην μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν τὴν ἔμφυτον αὐτοῦ καὶ συνυπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ ἀγεννήτως, κηρύσσων. These are the words of Asterius recorded by Athanasius, *Orat. 2. cont. Arianos.* [Orat. 1. 32. vol. i. p. 436 B.] In which place, notwithstanding, none can deny but Θεοῦ is twice taken without an article for the true and supreme God. Thus Didymus of Alexandria *de Spiritu Sancto* would distinguish between the person and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the addition or defect of the article; 'Apostoli quando intelligi volunt personam Spiritus Sancti addunt articulum, τὸ πνεῦμα, sine quo Spiritus Sancti dona notantur.' [See S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 123 D.] And Athanasius objects against his adversaries denying the Holy Ghost to be God, that they produced places out of the Prophets to prove him a creature, where πνεῦμα had not so much as an article prefixed, which might give some colour to interpret it of the Holy Spirit. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ κἂν τὸ ἄρθρον ἔχει τὸ παρὰ τοῦ προφήτου λεγόμενον νῦν πνεῦμα, ἵνα κἂν πρόφασιν ἔχητε. *Epist. ad Serapionem* [i. 7. vol. i. p. 655 C.] Whereas we find in the same place of St. John, the same Spirit in the same sense mentioned with and without an article. Ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, St. John iii. 5. and, Τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, ver. 6. So 1 John iv. 1. Μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα. And again, Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκετε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ· πᾶν πνεῦμα, &c. And beside, according to that distinction, τὸ πνεῦμα certainly stands for the gift of the Spirit, 1 Thess. v. 19. Τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. In the like manner, it is so far from truth, that the Scriptures observe so much the articles, as to use ὁ Θεός always for the true and supreme God, and Θεός for the false or inferior; that where the true is professedly opposed to the false, even there he is styled simply Θεός. As, Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεὸν, ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς· Νῦν δὲ γνόντες Θεὸν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. Gal. iv. 8, 9. And where the supreme is distinguished from him whom they make the inferior God, he is called likewise Θεός, without an article: as, Δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, and, Τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, Rom. i. 1, 4. Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1. And if this distinction were good, our Saviour's argument to the Pharisees were not so: Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Matth. xii. 28. For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferior or false God he cast out devils, that therefore the kingdom of the true and supreme God is come upon them*.

* [It is perhaps almost superfluous to refer to the admirable work of Bishop Middleton upon the Greek Article.]

Apostle should thus use this phrase: and then observing the manner of St. John's writing, who rises strangely by degrees, making the last word of the former sentence the first of that
John i. 4, 5. which followeth: As, *In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not:* so, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word,* which so was in the beginning, *was with God, and the Word was God;* that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, than by having the same Divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was the Divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

Secondly, he who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God), must of necessity be truly and essentially God; because there can be no equality between the Divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's
Phil. ii. 6, 7. womb, and existence in his human nature. For, *being* (or rather *subsisting*[15]) *in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our assertion. First, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly, that he was as much in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the Divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared a servant, when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For they were not all slaves which ever suffered such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation never lived as a servant unto any master on 122
earth. It is true, at first he was subject, but as a son, to his reputed father and undoubted mother. When he appeared in

15 'In effigie Dei constitutus.' *Tertul.* [*adv. Marcion.* v. 20. p. 486 B.] 'In figura Dei constitutus.' *S. Cyprian.* [Testim. ii. 13. p. 290.]

public, he lived after the manner of a Prophet and a Doctor sent from God, accompanied with a family, as it were, of his Apostles, whose master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that office, and obedient only unto God. The *form* then *of a servant*, which *he took upon him*, must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was, when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was *made flesh*, sent *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life, attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was *made of a woman, made under the law*, and so obliged to perform the same; which Law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and lived in a mean, low, and abject condition; *as a root out of a dry ground, he had no form nor comeliness*, and *when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him;* but *was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief:* in that he was thus made man, he *took upon him the form of a servant.* Which is not mine, but the Apostle's explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus; *He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the original text[16], and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication shewing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literal translation, *But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfy him, by *taking the form of a servant;* if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostle's resolution, by *being made in the likeness of men.*

John i. 14. Rom. viii. 3. Gal. iv. 4. Isa. liii. 2, 3.

16 Ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, which is also exactly observed by the vulgar Latin, *Sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus;* where γενόμενος is added by apposition to λαβών, and have both equal relation to ἐκένωσε· or, which is all one, ἐκένωσε λαβών, ἔλαβε γενόμενος.

Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with
Phil. ii. 8. a conjunction, to add another act of Christ's humiliation; *And being found in fashion as a man*, being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant or the likeness of men, *he humbled himself, and became* (or rather *becoming*[17]) *obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are
Ps. xl. 6. clearly in the Psalmist, *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened:* the Apostle appropriateth the sen-
Heb. x. 5. tence to Christ; *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.*
Exod. xxi. 6. Deut. xv. 17. Now being the boring of the ear under the Law was a note of perpetual servitude, being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist, and changed by the Apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth that when Christ's body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again, it appeareth out of the same text, that Christ was in 123
the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume, must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and, being so, to think it no robbery to be equal with God, and notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied, but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant, but by the emptying himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulness, as to fill any thing which hath no emptiness. But the fulness which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that ex-

[17] Ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος. For in both these verses there is but one conjunction, joining together two acts of our Saviour, his first exinanition, or ἐκένωσε, and his farther humiliation, or ἐταπείνωσε: the rest are all participles added for explication to the verbs.

inanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coæval with that precedent plenitude; then must we confess, Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second proposition.

Again, it is as evident from the same Scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God, as the form of a servant; and did as really subsist in the Divine nature, as in the nature of man. For he was so *in the form of God*, as thereby *to be equal with God*[18], But no other form beside the essential, which is

18 Τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ. *Pariari Deo.* Tertul. [*adv. Marcion.* v. 20. *de Resur. Carnis*, c. 6.] *Esse se æqualem Deo.* S. Cyprian. [Testim. ii. 13. p. 290.] *Esse æqualis Deo.* Leporius. [Gall. ix. p. 398 B.] Thus all express the notion of equality, not of similitude: nor can we understand any less by τὸ εἶναι ἴσα, than τὴν ἰσότητα, ἴσον and ἴσα being indifferently used by the Greeks, as Pindarus, *Olymp. Od.* 2. 109.

Ἴσον δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ,
Ἴσα δ' ἐν ἁμέραις ἅλιον ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον
Ἐσθλοὶ νέμονται βίοτον.

So whom the Greeks call ἰσόθεον, Homer ἴσα θεῷ.

Τὸν νῦν ἴσα θεῷ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορόωσι.
Ὀδ. ο'. 520.

Where ἴσα has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσορόωσι, but of a noun referred to the antecedent τόν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν νῦν ὡς ἰσόθεον. The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange; εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, *est spectari tanquam Deum.* As if he should have said, εἰσορόωσι signifies *spectant*, therefore εἶναι signifies *spectari.* This he was forced to put off thus, because the strength of our interpretation, rendering an equality, lies in the verb substantive τὸ εἶναι. As Dionysius of Alexandria very anciently, Κενώσας ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ταπεινώσας ἕως θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, ἴσα Θεῷ ὑπάρχει. *Epist. ad Paulum Samosat.* [p. 211.] For we acknowledge that ἴσα by itself oftimes signifieth no more than *instar*, and so inferreth nothing but a similitude: as we find it frequently in the book of Job. Where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle כ; as, כלילה *quasi in nocte*, ἴσα νυκτί, v. 14. כגבינה *sicut caseum*, ἴσα τυρῷ, x. 10. כרקב *quasi putredo*, *Sym.* ὁμοίως σηπεδόνι, LXX. ἴσα ἀσκῷ, xiii. 28. כמים *sicut aquam*, ἴσα ποτῷ, xv. 16. כעץ *tanquam lignum*, ἴσα ξύλῳ, xxiv. 20. כחמר *sicut lutum*, ἴσα πηλῷ, xxvii. 16. כמעיל *sicut vestimento*, ἴσα διπλοΐδι, xxix. 14. כבקר *quasi bos*, ἴσα βουσίν, xl. 15. [10.] Where we see the vulgar Latin useth for the Hebrew כ, *quasi, sicut, tanquam*, the LXX. ἴσα. Sometime it answereth to no word in the original, but supplieth a similitude understood, not expressed, in the Hebrew: as ועיר *tanquam pullum*, ἴσα ὄνῳ, xi. 12. ואבן *et lapis*, ἴσα λίθῳ, xxviii. 2. לחמר *luto*, ἴσα πηλῷ, xxx. 19. Once it rendereth an Hebrew word rather according to the intention, than the signification; משלי־אפר, *comparabitur cineri*, ad verbum *proverbia cineris*, ἴσα σποδῷ, xiii. 12. So that in all these places it is used adverbially for *instar*, and in none hath the addition of τὸ εἶναι to it. As for that answer of Socinus, that Christ cannot be God, because he is said to be equal with God, 'Tantum abest ut ex eo quod Christus sit æqualis Deo sequatur ipsum esse æternum et summum Deum, ut potius ex hoc ipso necessario consequatur, non esse æternum et summum Deum. Nemo enim sibi ipsi æqualis esse potest.' *Socin. ad* 8. *c. Vujek.* [Arg. iii. p. 576.] as if there could be no predication of equality where we find a substantial identity: it is most certainly false, because the most exact speakers use such language as this is. There can be no expressions more exact and pertinent than those which are used by geometricians, neither can there be any better judges of equality than they

Isa. xl. 25; xlvi. 5. the Divine nature itself, could confer an equality with God. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal? saith the Holy One.* There can be but one infinite, eternal, and independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, temporal, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternal, and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, *in the form of God,* not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the Apostle with a respect unto that other, of the *form of a servant,* exegetically continued 124
in the likeness of man; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as real and essential as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the Apostle's words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christ's exinanition. But by the *form* is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the *likeness* infallibly meant the real nature of man: nor doth the *fashion,* in which he was found, destroy, but rather assert the truth of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the express words of St. Paul, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signify the Divine, as the likeness of man the human nature; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a real existence before be was begotten of the Virgin, and that the

are; but they most frequently use that expression in this notion, proving an equality, and inferring it from identity. As in the fifth proposition of the first Element of Euclid, two lines are said to contain an angle equal to the angle contained by two other lines, because they contained the same angle, or γωνίαν κοινήν· and the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or βάσις κοινή. In the same manner certainly may the Son be said to be equal to the Father in essence or power, because they both have the same essence and power, that is οὐσίαν καὶ δύναμιν κοινήν. *Ocell. de Universo.* Ἀλλ' ἀεὶ κατά τ' αὐτὸ καὶ ὡσαύτως διατελεῖ καὶ ἴσον καὶ ὅμοιον αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ*. [c. i. § 6.]

* [It may be added, that there is a particular force in the form τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, which should be translated, *the being equal with God:* it implies, not that Christ was about to become equal with God, but that he was so already.]

being which he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly, he which is expressly styled *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation, as he is after, so was before any time assignable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other. *I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.* But Christ is expressly called *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first and the last. He so proclaimed himself by *a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.* Which answereth to that solemn call and proclamation in the Prophet, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called.* He comforteth St. John with the majesty of this title, *Fear not, I am the first and the last.* Which words were spoken by *one like unto the Son of man*, by him *that liveth, and was dead*, and is *alive for evermore*; that is undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the church of Smyrna in her tribulation by virtue of the same description, *These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive.* He ascertaineth his coming unto judgment with the same assertion, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* And in all these places, this title is attributed unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of restriction or limitation, without any assignation of any particular in respect of which he is the first or last; in the same latitude and eminence of expression[19], in which it is or can be attributed to the supreme God. There is yet another Scripture, in which the same description may seem of a more dubious interpretation: *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* For being it is *the Lord* who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood

Isa. xli. 4. xlviii. 12. xliv. 6. Rev. i. 10, 11. Isa. xlviii. 12. Rev. i. 17. Rev. i. 13. Rev. i. 18. Rev. ii. 8. Rev. xxii. 13. Rev. i. 8.

19 With the article so much elsewhere stood upon, Τὸ *α καὶ τὸ ω, ὁ πρῶτος, καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, The Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last.* For we must not take τὸ *α* as the grammarians do, by which they signify only the letter written in that figure, and called by that name. As appeareth by Eratosthenes, who was called Βῆτα, not *τὰ βήματα*, as Suidas corruptly. Hesychius Illustrius, from whom Suidas had that passage: Ἐρατοσθένης διὰ τὸ δευτερεύειν ἐν παντὶ εἴδει παιδείας τοῖς ἄκροις ἐγγίσαντα Βῆτα ἐπεκλήθη. And Martianus Heracleota *in Periplo*, Καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον Ἐρατοσθένης, ὃν Βῆτα ἐκάλεσαν οἱ τοῦ Μουσείου προστάντες. [Hæsch. Geogr. p. 95.]

The central point on which Christianity

of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent and the following words imply, then is he certainly that *Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;* that is, the supreme eternal God, of the same Divine
Rev. i. 4. essence with the Father, who was before described by *him which* 125
is, and which was, and which is to come, to whom the six-winged
Rev. iv. 8. beasts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come:* as the familiar explication of that
Exod. iii. 14. name which God revealed to Moses. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; then did he so describe himself unto St. John, and express his supreme Deity, that by those words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending,* he might be known to be the one Almighty and Eternal God; and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being Christ hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same style upon him, by which the Father did express his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declared himself to be the Supreme, Almighty, and Eternal God. And being thus the *Alpha* and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the Almighty and Eternal God.

Fourthly, he whose glory Isaiah saw in the year that king Uzziah died, had a being before Christ was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the Divine essence, by which he was
Isa. vi. i. 3. naturally and essentially God: for he is expressly called *the Lord, Holy, holy, holy the Lord of hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth;* which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But Christ was he whose glory Isaiah saw, as
John xii. 41. St. John doth testify, saying, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him:* and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly Christ; for of him the Apostle
John xii. 36. treateth in that place, and of none but him. *These things spake*
John xii. 37. *Jesus and departed. But though he* (that is, Jesus) *had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him,* that is, Christ who wrought those miracles. The reason why they
John xii. 38. believed not on him was, *that the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our*

report? and as they did not, so *they could not believe* in Christ, John xii.
because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and 39, 40.
hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them. For those who God foresaw, and the Prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the Jews refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of whom the Prophet spake: for *these things said Esaias* John xii.
when he saw his glory, and spake of him. Now if the glory which 41.
Isaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Isaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardened hearts belong unto these Jews, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that prophecy upon that people, which saw our Saviour's miracles, depend upon Isaiah's vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore St. John hath infallibly taught us, that the Prophet saw the glory of Christ; and the Prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he, whose glory then he saw, was the one omnipotent and eternal God; and consequently both together have sealed this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternal Godhead.

Lastly, he who, being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner, as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other than the Divine essence; because all novelty is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God,
126 who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred Scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternal God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already proved, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one Divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore, were it not said in the Scriptures, there are *many gods;* did not he 1 Cor. viii.
himself who is supreme, call others so; we durst not give that 5.
name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to

have alleged that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternal Deity: whereas now we are answered, that there are gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name that he is the one eternal God. But if Christ be none of those many gods, and yet be God; then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbered with them, is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We read in the Psalmist, *I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.* But we must not reckon Christ among those gods, we must not number the only-begotten Son among those children. For *they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darkness:* and whosoever were gods only as they were, either did, or might do so. Whereas Christ, in whom alone *dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,* is not only distinguished from, but opposed to, such gods as those, by his Disciples saying, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things;* by himself proclaiming, *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.* St. Paul hath told us, *there be gods many, and lords many;* but withal hath taught us, that *to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ.* In which words as the *Father* is opposed as much unto the *many lords* as *many gods,* so is the Son as much unto the *many gods* as *many lords;* the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many gods, and whosoever is called God, must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we read him often styled God, it followeth, that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternal God.

Ps. lxxxii. 6.

Ps. lxxxii. 5.

Col. ii. 9.

John xvi. 30.

John viii. 12.

1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternal power and Godhead. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it always signifies the supreme Power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an article, by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these

two rules they have raised unto themselves this observation, that whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those gods who are excluded from the majesty of the eternal Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission (whereof examples are innumerable); though if
127 those rules were granted, yet would not their conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an article, and therefore the same name may signify the same God when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so far as can concern the omission of the article: yet to complete my demonstration, I shall shew, first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ; secondly, that the same name with the article affixed is attributed unto him; thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate, which hath as great a virtue to signify that excellency as the article could have.

St. Paul, unfolding the mystery of godliness, hath delivered six propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And this God, which is the subject of all these propositions, must be understood of Christ, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently *God manifested in the flesh.* Upon him the Spirit descended at his baptism, and after his ascension was poured upon his Apostles, ratifying his commission, and confirming the doctrine which they received from him: wherefore he was *God justified in the Spirit.* His nativity the angels celebrated, in the discharge of his office they ministered unto him, at his resurrection and ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: he was therefore *God seen of angels.* The apostles preached unto all nations, and he whom they preached was Jesus Christ. The Father *separated* St. Paul *from his mother's womb, and called him*

1 Tim. iii. 16.

Acts viii. 5, 35; ix. 20; xi. 20; xvii. 3, 18; xix. 13.

Rom. xvi. 25. 2 Cor. i. 19; xi. 4. Phil. i. 18. Gal. i. 15, 16. Acts xix. 4. Gal. ii. 16. Acts xvi. 31.

by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen: therefore he was *God preached unto the Gentiles.* John the Baptist *spake unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. We have believed in Jesus Christ,* saith St. Paul, who so taught the gaoler trembling at his feet, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved:* he therefore was *God believed on in the world.* When he had been forty days on earth after his resurrection, he was taken visibly up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was *God received up into glory.* And thus all these six propositions, according to the plain and familiar language of the Scriptures, are infallibly true of Christ, and so of God, as he is taken by St. John, when he speaks those words, *the Word was God.* But all these cannot be understood of any other, which either is, or is called, God. For though we grant the Divine perfections and attributes to be the same with the Divine essence, yet are they never in the Scriptures called God; nor can any of them with the least show of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions, or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that God, that is the will[20] of God, *was manifested in the flesh,* that is, was revealed by frail and mortal men, and *received up in glory,* that is, was received gloriously on earth[21], they teach us a language which the Scriptures know not[22], and the Holy Ghost 128

20 'Deus, i. e. voluntas ipsius de servandis hominibus, per homines infirmos et mortales perfecte patefacta est, &c.' *Catech. Racov. ad Quæst.* 59. [p. 77.]

21 'Insignem in modum et summa cum gloria recepta fuit.' *Ibid.* 16.

22 For Θεός is not θέλημα Θεοῦ, much less is ἀνελήφθη *received* or *embraced.* Elias speaketh not of his reception, but his ascension, when he saith to Elisha, Τί ποιήσω σοι πρὶν ἢ ἀναληφθῆναί με ἀπὸ σοῦ; 2 Kings ii. 9; and, ver. 11, Ἐὰν ἴδῃς με ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ ἔσται σοὶ οὕτως. When he actually ascended, as the original, ויעל, it is no otherwise translated by the Septuagint, than ἀνελήφθη Ἠλιοὺ ἐν συσσεισμῷ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Which language was preserved by the Hellenizing Jews: Ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἐν λαίλαπι πυρός. Sirac. xlviii. 9; and again, Ἀνελήφθη ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 1 Mac. ii. 58. Neither did they use it of Elias only, but of Enoch also. Οὐδὲ εἷς ἐκτίσθη οἷος Ἐνὼχ,—καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Sirac. xlix. 14. The same language is continued in the New Testament of our Saviour's ascension, Ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Mark xvi. 19. Ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Acts i. 11; and singly, ἀνελήφθη. Acts i. 2; and ἀνελήφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν. Acts i. 22. As therefore ἀνάληψις τοῦ Μωσέως, in the language of the Jews, was not the reception of Moses by the Israelites, but the assumption of his body; so ἀνάληψις τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the ascension of Christ, Luke ix. 51. Wherefore this being the constant notion of the word, it must so be here likewise understood, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ· as the vulgar Latin, (whose authority is pretended against us,) *assumptum est in gloria*; rendering it here by the same word by which he always translated ἀνελήφθη.

never used; and as no attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God: not the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being justified by the Spirit; not the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore that, whereas the Son is the only person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here jointly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed universally in the copies of the original language[23], so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

[23] For being the epistle was written in the Greek language, it is enough if all those copies do agree. Nor need we be troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place: 'Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs et Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt, ὃ ἐφανερώθη.' I confess the vulgar Latin reads it otherwise than the Greek, *Quod manifestatum est in carne;* and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read ὅ instead of Θεός. But the joint consent of the Greek copies and interpreters is above the authority of those two translators, and the Arabic set forth in the *Biblia Polyglotta* agreeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath farther observed is of far greater consideration: 'Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55, illud Θεός hic positum a Nestorianis.' [Comm. ad loc. vol. ii. p. 969.] For if at first the Greeks read ὃ ἐφανερώθη, and that ὅ were altered into Θεός by the Nestorians, then ought we to correct the Greek copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our argument. But first, it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the original, ὅ, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενον. *Concil. Ephes. par.* i. *cap.* 17. [Mansi, iv. 1009 B.] Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because the Catholic Greeks read it Θεός before there were such heretics, so called 'Nestoriani a Nestorio Episcopo, (Patriarcha Constantinopolitano).' *S. August. Hæres.* [see S. Aug. vol. viii. p. 28, note.] Nestorius, from whom that heresy began, was patriarch of Constantinople after Sisinnius, Sisinnius after Atticus, Atticus after Nectarius, who succeeded Joannes, vulgarly called Chrysostomus. But St. Chrysostom read not ὅ, but Θεός, as appears by his commentaries upon the place; Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, τουτέστιν, ὁ δημιουργός. [Hom. xi. c. 3. vol. xi. p. 606 A.] And St. Cyril, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon the first appearance of his heresy, wrote two large epistles to the queens Pulcheria and Eudocia, in both which he maketh great use of this text. In the first, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek copies, he proceedeth thus; Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς; ἢ δῆλον, ὅτι πάντη τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος· οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. [Cyril. Alex. de Recta Fide, vol. v. pt. ii. p. 224 C.] Wherefore in St. Paul he read Θεός *God*, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text *verbatim*, he manageth it thus against Nestorius; Εἰ Θεὸς ὢν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπῆσαι λέγοιτο, καὶ οὐ δήπου μεθεὶς τὸ εἶναι Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ἦν ἀεὶ διαμένων, μέγα δὴ τότε καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· εἰ δὲ ἄνθρωπος νοεῖται κοινὸς ὁ Χριστός,—πῶς ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανέρωται; καί τοι πῶς οὐχ ἅπασιν ἐναργὲς, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαρκί τε ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἑτέρως ὁρῶτό τισι. [Ibid. p. 153 D.] And in the explanation of his second Anathematism, he

Again, St. Paul speaketh thus to the elders of the Church of
Acts xx. 28. Ephesus; *Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* In these words this doctrinal proposition is clearly contained; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the text which can by any gram-

maketh use of no other text but this, to prove the hypostatical union, giving it this gloss or exposition: Τί ἐστι τὸ, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; τουτέστι, γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, &c. [vol. vi. p. 148 C.] The same he urgeth in his *Scholion in Unigeniti Incarnatione.* So also Theodoret, contemporary with St. Cyril: Θεὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ Θεοῦ υἱὸς, καὶ ἀόρατον ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, δῆλος ἅπασιν ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο, σαφῶς δὲ ἡμᾶς δύο φύσεις ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θείαν ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν. Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεός into the Greek text, but that he which put it in was cast out of his bishopric for a Nestorian: his words are these; 'Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt: sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, et illum Apostoli locum ubi dicit, *quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu*, per cognationem Græcarum literarum, O et Θ, hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit *Qui*, hoc est ΟΣ, monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit; et fecit ΘΣ, id est ut esset, *Deus apparuit per carnem.* Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus.' *Hincm. Opusc.* lv. *cap.* 18. [vol. ii. p. 449.] Now whereas Hincmarus says *expulsus legitur*, we read not in Euagrius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Joannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his bishopric for any such falsation. It is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus, a deacon of the Church of Carthage, who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the Ecclesiastical Histories and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth tome of the Councils. In which, chap. xix. [p. 134] we have the same relation, only with this difference, that O is not turned into Θ, but into Ω, and so ΟΣ becomes not ΘΣ, but ΩΣ. So that first the Greek copies are not said to have read it ὅ, but ὅς, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the vulgar Latin. Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter changed, no such mutation can of ΟΣ make ΘΕΟΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian; and he ejected him* as he did other Catholic Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. Howsoever Macedonius could not falsify all the Greek copies, when, as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge Θεός. And if he had been ejected for substituting Θεός, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring ὅς, which we find not in any copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the text by reading Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, but that the ancient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently, being the Greek is the original, this lection must be acknowledged authentical †.

* [The fifth and following editions read *not as he did.*]

† [The fullest information upon the various readings in this passage is given by Berriman, in his *Critical Dissertation.* He sums up the evidence by saying that ninety-one Greek MSS. read Θεός. Four MSS. have been said to read ὅ, but not one reads it: five have been said to read ὅς, but only three do so for certain.]

matical construction be joined with the verb, except the Holy
129 Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, and *without blood-shed there is no remission;* if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joined to his Church[24], be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture truth, God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God hath so purchased the Church. We *were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God *hath purchased us with his own blood.* But no other person which is, or is called, God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatorship; and *there is* but *one Mediator between God and men:* and the Church is *sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this blood signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a

Heb. ix. 22.

1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

1 Tim. ii. 5.

Heb. x. 10.

24 Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. For though the Church be properly the Church of Christ, Matt. xvi. 18. Col. i. 24, and in the plural we read once αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. xvi. 16, as we do of the *Churches of God,* 1 Cor. xi. 16. 2 Thess. i. 4. and 1 Thess. ii. 14; yet ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is frequently used; as 1 Cor. i. 2. and x. 32. and xv. 9. and xi. 22. 2 Cor. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 5. 15; but ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this text, or to fancy it first written χοῦ, and then made θοῦ, when it is so often written Θεοῦ, not Χριστοῦ. Some MSS., as the Alexandrian, Cantabrigian, and New Coll. MSS., read it τοῦ Κυρίου, and the interpreter of Irenæus, *Regere Ecclesiam Domini, lib.* iii. *cap.* 14. Others represent Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, followed by the Arabic interpreter; which makes not at all against our argument; but, because in this particular unusual, not like to be true. The Syriac translating it *Christi,* (דמשיחא not *Domino,* as it is in the Latin translation,) gives rather an exposition than a version *.

* [It is stated by Professor Lee, that the oldest MSS. of the Syriac version read *Dei* and not *Christi.* The Vatican MS. reads Θεοῦ.]

ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it *by his own blood;* for then it would follow, that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Beside, it is very observable, that this particular phrase of *his own blood,* is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of another [25]: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him; yet we cannot but acknowledge, that the blood and death was of another than the Father. *Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place;* and whereas *the high priest entered every year with the blood of others,* Christ *appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* He then which purchased us wrought it by his own blood, as an High Priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when St. Paul speaketh of *the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness; his,* that is, *his own righteousness,* hath reference to God the Father; but *his,* that is, *his own blood,* must be referred to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of this acknowledgment he brings in *the Beloved, in whom we have* 130 *redemption through his blood,* as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Christ hath blessed us; and the Apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us; which is true, because *he sent his Son to bless us.* Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father; and the Apostle saith, the Father hath *made known unto us the mystery of his will;* because he sent his Son to reveal

Heb. ix. 12.
Heb. ix. 25, 26.
Rom. iii. 24, 25. Ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ.
Eph. i. 6, 7.
Acts iii. 26.
Eph. i. 9.

[25] Ἴδιον αἷμα is opposed to αἷμα ἀλλότριον. And therefore it is observable that the author of the Racovian Catechism, in his answer to this place of Scripture, doth never make the least mention of ἴδιον or *proprium,* but only affirms that the blood of Christ may be called the blood of God the Father; and *totidem verbis* did Socinus answer to Wiekus [Vujekius] before, but in his whole answer concealed the force of ἴδιον, whereas the strength of our argument lies in those words, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, or, as the Alexandrian MS. and one mentioned by Beza, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

it. Christ hath delivered us; and the Father is said to *deliver us from the power of darkness:* not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these general acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these acts. For though it is true, that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son *gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us;* the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son: and therefore the Apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, *who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood.* Now this blood is not only the blood of the new covenant, and consequently of the Mediator, but the nature of this covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testator: *for where a Testament* is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator.* But the Testator which died is not, cannot be, the Father, but the Son; and consequently the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but only Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three assertions, that the name of God, absolutely taken and placed subjectively, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

Col. i. 13.

Gal. i. 4.

Col. i. 13, 14.

Heb. ix. 16.

The second, that the name of God invested by way of excellency with an article is attributed in the Scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good. He which is called Emmanuel, is named God by way of excellency: for that name, saith St. Matthew, *being interpreted is, God with us,* and in that interpretation the Greek article is prefixed. But Christ is called Emmanuel; *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.* Therefore he is that *God with us,* which is expressed by way of excel-

Matt. i. 23.

Matt. i. 22, 23. Καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ· ὅ

* [The word διαθήκη, which is here translated *a testament,* is rendered in almost every other passage of the New Testament, and even in this chapter, *a covenant,* and so it perhaps ought to be rendered here.]

ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.

lency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name: for it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is called Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as

Exod. xvii. 15. Judg. vi. 24. Jer. xxxiii. 16.

Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi, and Gideon another *called Jehovah Shalom,* and yet neither altar was Jehovah; as Jerusalem was called, *The Lord our righteousness,* and yet that city was not the Lord. Because these two notions, which are conjoined in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First he is *Emmanu,* that is, *with us,* for he hath

John i. 14.

dwelt among us: and when he parted from the earth, he said to

Mat. xxviii. 20. Ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί.

his Disciples, *I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* Secondly, he is *El,* and that name was given him, as the same Prophet testifieth, *For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is*

Isa. ix. 6. אל גבור

given: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God. He then who is both properly called *El,* that is, *God,* and is also really *Emmanu,* that is, *with us,* he must infallibly be that *Emmanuel,* who is *God with us.* Indeed if the name

Ezek. xlviii. 35.

Emmanuel were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, *God is with us,* as *the Lord our righteousness,* and *the Lord is there,* must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem, then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his 131
Church; and if we under the Gospel have been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the Messias, as the name of Jesus. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the evangelical interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

John xx. 28.

Again, he to whom St. Thomas said, *My Lord and my God,* or rather, *The Lord of me, and the God of me,* he is that God before whose name the Greek article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But St. Thomas spake these words to Christ[26].

[26] Indeed it hath been answered, that these words are not to be referred to Christ, but to God the Father. So Theodorus Mopsuestenus in his Commentary on St. John; 'Thomas quidem, cum sic credidisset, *Dominus meus et Deus meus* dicit, non ipsum Dominum et Deum dicens (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat et Deum esse eum qui resurrexit) sed quasi pro miraculoso facto Deum collaudat.' *Syn. V. Collat.* 4. [xv. Mansi ix. p. 209 B.] As if Thomas had intended only to have praised God for raising Christ. But first, it is plain that Thomas answered Christ; secondly, that he spake unto *him,* that is, to Christ, and consequently that the words which he spake belong to Christ; thirdly, that the words are a confession of his faith in Christ, as our Saviour doth acknowledge. And whereas Franciscus Davidis did object, that in a Latin Testament

For *Jesus spake unto Thomas, and Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.* And in these words he made confession of his faith[27]; for our Saviour replied, *Thomas, because thou* John xx. 29.

he found not *et dixit ei*, but *et dixit* without *ei*, it is sufficiently discountenanced by Socinus in his epistle, affirming that all the Greek and Latin copies had it, except that one which he had found: and therefore the omission must be imputed to the negligence of the printer.

27 Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. Either in these words there is an ellipsis of εἶ σύ, *Thou art my Lord, thou art my God;* or an antiptosis, the nominative case used for the vocative, as Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, Mark xv. 34; Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, Mark xiv. 36; and Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, John xix. 3. If it be an ellipsis of the verb εἶ, so frequent in the Scriptures, and of the person sufficiently understood in the preceding pronoun, then is it evident that ὁ Θεός, is attributed unto Christ, for then St. Thomas said unto him, *Thou art* ὁ Θεός μου. If it be an antiptosis, though the construction require not a verb, yet the signification virtually requireth as much, which is equivalent; for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm him to be so. Neither can it be objected that the article ὁ serveth only in the place of ὦ, as signifying that the nominative is to be taken for the vocative case; because the nominative may as well stand vocatively without an article, as Ἰωσὴφ υἱὸς Δαβίδ. Matt. i. 20. and Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβίδ. Matt. xx. 30, 31; and therefore when the vocative is invested with an article, it is as considerable as in a nominative. And being these words were an expression of the Apostle's faith, as Christ understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a proposition; because no act of our faith can be expressed, where the object is not at least a virtual proposition. And in that proposition, ὁ Θεός must be the predicate, and Christ, to whom these words are spoken, must also be the subject. It cannot therefore be avoided, but that St. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an article. Indeed to me there is no doubt but St. Thomas in these words did make as true and real a confession of his faith concerning the Person of Christ, as St. Peter did, when he *answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,* Matt. xvi. 16; and consequently, that ὁ Κύριος and ὁ Θεός do as properly belong unto him, as St. Peter's ὁ Χριστός and ὁ υἱός. As therefore Christ said to his Disciples, *Vos vocatis me* ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ Κύριος, *et bene dicitis, sum etenim,* John xiii. 13; so he might have replied to Thomas, *You call me* ὁ Κύριος *and* ὁ Θεός, *and you say well, for I am so.* As for the objection of Socinus, that though Θεός be here spoken of Christ, and that with an article ὁ, yet that article is of no force, because of the following pronoun μου, it is most groundless: for the article ὁ cannot have relation to the following pronoun μου. Ἐπεὶ πῶς ἡ ἀπαράδεκτος ἀντωνυμία τῶν ἄρθρων ἐν γενικῇ πτώσει εὐθείας ἄρθρον παραδέχεται· as that great critic Apollonius Alexandrinus observes, *lib.* i. *de Syntaxi, cap.* 30. And if for μου it were ὁ ἐμός, yet even that article would belong to Θεός, for in these words, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐμός, neither article belongs to ἐμός, but both to Θεός· for, as the same critic observes in the same case, τὰ δύο ἄρθρα εἰς μίαν τὴν εὐθείαν ἀναφέρεται· οὐκ ἄρα ἐν τῷ, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐμὸς, κατηνάγκασται τὸ ἕτερον τῶν ἄρθρων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντωνυμίαν φέρεσθαι. So that if ὁ Θεός be *the supreme God*, then ὁ Θεός μου must be *my supreme God:* as when David speaks to God Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός μου, πρός σε ὀρθρίζω, Psal. lxii. 1, the latter is of as great importance as the former. So again, Psal. xlii. 4. Ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν κιθάρᾳ, ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός μου· and xlix. 3. Ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἥξει, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν· and lxx. 12. Ὁ Θεὸς μὴ μακρύνῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὁ Θεός μου. I dare not therefore say to any person, that he is ὁ Θεός μου, except I do believe that he is ὁ Θεός. Wherefore I conclude that the words of St. Thomas, Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, are as fully and highly significative as those of David, Πρόσχες τῇ φωνῇ τῆς δεήσεώς μου, ὁ Βασιλεύς μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, Psal. v. 2. or those, Ὁ

hast seen me, thou hast believed. And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord and the God of an Apostle.

Nor have we only their required testimony of Christ's supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not only termed *the God*, but, for a further certainty, *the true God:* and the same Apostle, who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate Authors, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, *we know*, saith he, *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us* 132
an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life[28]. As therefore we read in the Acts of the *word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all:* where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun *he*[29] joined unto *Jesus Christ*, the immediate, not unto *God*, the remote antecedent: so likewise here *the true God* is to be referred unto *Christ*, who stands next unto it, not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the text, but at a distance. There is no reason alleged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when *another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred; the same* referreth us not to Joseph, but to the king of Egypt. Whereas, if nothing else can be objected but a possibility in respect of the grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred as the king of Egypt; for whatsoever the incongruity be in history, it makes no solecism in the syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate antecedent to which the relative may properly be referred; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh; being this is rendered as a reason why *we are in him that is true*, by being *in his Son*, to wit, because that Son *is the true God;*

1 John v. 20.

Acts x. 36.

Acts vii. 18, 19.

Θεός μου καὶ ὁ Κύριός μου, εἰς τὴν δίκην μου, Psal. xxxv. 23. or those, Τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου, Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ Βασιλεύς μου, καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, Psal. lxxxiv. 3. or those of St. John in the Revelation [iv. 11.] as they lie in the Alexandrian and Complutensian copies; Ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιος, λαβεῖν, &c. or that lastly in the most ancient hymn, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ——ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.

28 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. 'Hic agitur non solum de vero Deo, sed de illo uno vero Deo, ut articulus in Græco additus indicat.' *Catech. Racov.* [c. i. §. 1. p. 52.]

29 Οὗτος for ὅς, as Acts viii. 26. Ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος. *quæ est deserta.*

being in the language of St. John the constant title of our Saviour is *eternal life;* being all these reasons may be drawn out of the text itself, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; I can conclude no less, than that our Saviour is *the true God*, so styled in the Scriptures by way of eminency, with an article prefixed, as the first Christian writers which immediately followed the Apostles did both speak and write[30].

But, thirdly, were there no such particular place in which the article were expressed, yet shall we find such adjuncts fixed to the name of God when attributed unto Christ, as will prove equivalent to an article, or whatsoever may express the supreme Majesty. As when St. Paul doth magnify the Jews, *out of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.* First, it is evident that Christ is called God[31], even he who came of the Jews, though not as he came Rom. ix. 5.

30 Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Θεόν. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.* [c. 1. p. 33.] Ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. *Idem, Epist. ad Ephes.* [c. 1. Procem. p. 11.] Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας. *Ibid.* [c. 18. p. 15.] Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν Πατρὶ ὢν μᾶλλον φαίνεται. *Epist. ad Rom.* [c. 3. p. 27.] Τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμεῖς. *S. Clem. Alex. ad Gentes.* [c. i. vol. i. p. 6.] And it was well observed by the author of the Μικρὰ Λαβύρινθος, written about the beginning of the third century, that not only the ancienter Fathers before him, as Justin, Miltiades, Tatianus, Clemens, Irenæus, Melito, &c. did speak of Christ as God, but that the hymns also penned by Christians from the beginning did express Christ's divinity. Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες. [apud Eus. H. E. v. 28. p. 252.] And the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan testifies the same: 'Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere.' l. x. ep. 97.

31 Though some would leave *God* out of the text, upon this pretence, because St. Cyprian, *lib.* ii. *adv. Judæos,* [c. 6. p. 287.] citing this place, leaves it out. But that must needs be by the negligence of some of the scribes, as is evident. First, because Manutius and Morellius found the word *Deus* in their copies, and both the MSS. which Pamelius used acknowledge it. Secondly, because St. Cyprian produceth the text to prove *quod Deus Christus;* and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is called expressly God. Thirdly, because Tertullian, whose disciple St. Cyprian professed himself, did both so read it, and so use it. 'Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem Apostolus: *Ex quibus Christus, qui est,* inquit, *Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne.' Adv. Praxeam.* [c. 13. p. 507 D.] And again, in the same book, 'Hunc et Paulus conspexit, nec tamen Patrem vidit. *Nonne,* inquit, *vidi Jesum?* Christum autem et ipse Deum cognominavit: *Quorum Patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est per* (vel *super*) *omnia Deus benedictus in ævum.*' [c. 15. p. 509 A.] Novatian, *de Trinitate* [c. 13, 30], useth the same argument. And another ancient author very expressly; 'Rogo te, Deum credis esse Filium, an non? Sine dubio, responsurus es, Deum; quia etsi negare volueris, sanctis Scripturis convinceris, dicente Apostolo, *Ex quibus Christus*

of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distin- 133
guished from his Godhead[32]. Secondly, he is so called God as not to be any of the many gods, but the one supreme or most high God; for he *is God over all*[33]. Thirdly, he hath also added the title of *blessed*, which of itself elsewhere signifieth the supreme God[34], and was always used by the Jews to express

secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula.' So also St. Augustin, 'Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut omnes etiam hæretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius; quod, velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apostolo, *Qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula.*' *De Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 13. [§. 23. vol. viii. p. 786 A.] *et cont. Faustum, lib.* xvi. *cap.* 15. [ib. p. 292 A.] As for the objection, that St. Chrysostom doth not signify in his Commentaries that he read Θεός in the text: I answer, that neither does he signify that he read ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, for in his exposition he passeth over wholly ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, but it doth not follow that he read not ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων in the text. But when he repeats the words of the Apostle, he agrees wholly with the Greek text, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός· [Hom. xvi. §. 1. vol. ix. p. 604 E.] and Theodoret, who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but give a full exposition of them: Ἥρκει μὲν ἡ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα προσθήκη παραδηλῶσαι τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ τὴν θεότητα· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἰρηκὼς, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, ἐπήγαγε, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει· οὕτως ἐνταῦθα εἰπὼν τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, προστέθεικε τὸ, ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. [In loc. vol. iii. p. 74 B.] As for the omission of *Deus* in St. Hilary on the Psalms, it must of necessity be attributed to the negligence of the scribe, not to the reading of the Father. For how he read it, he hath clearly expressed in his books *de Trinitate:* [viii. 37. p. 969 E.] 'Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens, *Quorum Patres, et ex quibus Christus qui est super omnia Deus.* Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, sed creaturarum Deus est, qui super omnia Deus est.' The pretence therefore of Erasmus from the Fathers is vain; and as vain is that of Grotius from the Syriac translation, which hath in it the name of *God* expressly, as well as all the copies of the original, and all the rest of the translations, דאיתוהי אלהא דעל כל*.

[32] Τὸ κατὰ σάρκα opposed unto τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα. As Rom. i. 3. where κατὰ σάρκα is used without an article, because κατὰ πνεῦμα, to which it is opposed, followeth, and so the opposition is of itself apparent. But here being κατὰ πνεῦμα is not to be expressed in the following words, the article τό, signifying of itself a distinction or exception, sheweth that it is to be understood.

[33] Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. Not *in omnibus*, as Erasmus, nor *super omnes*, as Beza, with reference to the Fathers, which should have been ἐπὶ πάντων αὐτῶν· but as the vulgar translation, and the ancient Fathers before that, *super omnia*, ἐπί for ἐπάνω, as John iii. 31. Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί, which signifieth no less than עליון the ordinary name of God, ὁ ὕψιστος, *the Most High*, as it is taken for the supreme God by itself, Acts vii. 48. and is described, Psalm xcvii. 9. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, σφόδρα ὑπερυψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεούς.

[34] As Mark xiv. 61. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς

* [To the Fathers mentioned in this note we may add Irenæus, III. 16. 3. p. 205. Hippolytus, *cont. Noëtum*, c. 2, 6. Origen, *in Rom.* vii. 13. vol. iv. p. 612 B. Concil. Antioch. (A.D. 269.) *apud Routh. Rel. Sacr.* II. p. 467. Athanas. *Orat.* IV. *cont. Arian.* I. vol. i. p. 617 C. *Epist.* II. *ad Serap.* 2. p. 684 A. *Epist. ad Epict.* 10. p. 908 E. *Cont. Apol.* I. 10. p. 930 D. Epiphan. *Hær.* LVII. [vol. i.] p. 487 D. *Hær.* LXXIV. 6. p. 894 C. *Hær.* LXXVI. p. 977-8. Theodoret. *Hær. Fab.* V. 14. vol. iv. p. 287 A, all of whom quote the passage as proving the divinity of Christ.]

that one God of Israel. Wherefore it cannot be conceived St. Paul should write unto the Christians, most of which then were converted Jews or proselytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but also add that title which they always gave unto the one God of Israel, and to none but him; except he did intend they should believe him to be the same God whom they always in that manner, and under that notion, had adored. As therefore the Apostle speaketh of *the God and* 2 Cor. xi. *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore,* 31. of the Creator, *who is blessed for ever, Amen;* and thereby doth Rom. i. 25. signify the supreme Deity, which was so glorified by the Israelites; and doth also testify that we worship the same God under the Gospel which they did under the Law: so doth he speak of Christ in as sublime a style, *who is over all, God blessed for ever,* Rom. ix. 5. *Amen;* and thereby doth testify the equality, or rather identity, of his Deity. If we consider the scope of the Apostle, which is to magnify the Israelites by the enumeration of such privileges as belonged peculiarly to that chosen nation (the most eminent of which was contained in the genealogy of our Saviour), we shall find their glory did not consist in this, that Christ at first was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God; for what great honour could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whose Godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honourable, and the peculiar glory of that nation, that the most high God blessed for ever should *take on* Heb. ii. 16. *him the seed of Abraham,* and come out of the Israelites *as concerning the flesh.* Thus every way it doth appear the Apostle spake of Christ as of the one eternal God.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; he whose glory Isaias saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled *Alpha* and *Omega* without

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; *Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed?* where the vulgar attribute is taken for God himself, which is usually added to the name of God, as 2 Cor. xi. 31. *Ὁ Θεὸς——ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας·* or to any description of him; as *Ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν.* Rom. i. 25. And these expressions of St. Paul are consonant to the ancient custom of the Jews, who, when the priest in the sanctuary rehearsed the name of God, were wont to answer, *Blessed be his name for ever.* Insomuch as *the Blessed One* did signify in their language as much as *the Holy One;* and both, or either of them, the God of Israel. Hence are so frequent in the Rabbins, הקדוש ברוך הוא *the Holy Blessed One,* and ברוך הוא *the Blessed One,* that they are written by abbreviation, ה"הקב or ה"הב; *and the infinite Blessed One,* ס"א ב"ה; *Blessed be God for ever, Amen and amen,* ב"לאו, and י"לאו.

any restriction or limitation; he who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those ways by which the supreme Deity is expressed; he had a being before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary, and the being which he had was the one eternal and indivisible Divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. But all these are certainly true of him in whom we 134
believe, Jesus Christ, as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred Scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the Virgin was not any created, but the Divine essence; nor was he any Creature, but the true eternal God: which was our second assertion, particularly opposed to the Arian heresy[35].

The third assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, that the Divine essence which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, that there can be but one essence properly Divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and majesty; that there can be but one person[36] originally of himself subsisting in that infinite Being, because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not

[35] This heresy was so called from two who bare the same name, and fell at the same time into the same opinion: one of them being a presbyter, and rector of a church in Alexandria, the other a deacon: as Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, in his epistle extant in Theodoret, Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀναθεματισθέντες αἱρεσιῶται, ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων μὲν Ἄρειος, ἀπὸ διακόνων δὲ, Ἀχιλλᾶς, Εὐζώϊος,—Ἄρειος ἕτερος, &c. [Theod. H. E. lib. i. c. 4. p. 21.] In the epistle of the Arians to Alexander, he is reckoned amongst the presbyters; Ἄρειος, Ἀειθαλὴς, Ἀχιλλᾶς, Καρπώνης, Σαρματᾶς, Ἄρειος, πρεσβύτεροι. Of these two Phœbadius *cont. Arian. cap.* 25. [c. xiii. p. 253 B.] 'Patrem et filium non esse unam personam, ut Sabellius, aut duas substantias, ut Arius.' The heresy is so well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed it cannot be better described than in the anathematism of the Nicene Council. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ Καθολικὴ καὶ Ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία. [Socr. H. E. lib. i. c. 8. p. 24.] Thus translated by St. Hilary; 'Eos autem qui dicunt, erat quando non erat, et antequam nasceretur non erat, et quod de non extantibus factus est, vel ex alia substantia aut essentia, dicentes esse convertibilem et demutabilem Deum, hos anathematizat Catholica Ecclesia.' [De Synod. c. 84. p. 1198 B.]

[36] Ἕνα γὰρ οἴδαμεν ἀγέννητον, καὶ μίαν τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὴν, τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *S. Basil. Epist.* 78. [Epist. cxxv. 3. vol. iii. p. 216 D.] Ἓν ἀγέννητον, ὁ Πατήρ. *Alex. Epist. apud Theodoretum.* [lib. i. c. 4.]

receiving his eternal being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, being we have already proved that he is truly and properly the eternal God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the Father, who is not only eternally, but originally God. *All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine*[37], saith Christ; because in him is the same fulness of the Godhead, and more than that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the Godhead not from the Son, nor any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father: Christ is the true God and eternal life; but that he is so, is from the Father: *for as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*[38], not by participation, but by communication. It is true, our Saviour was so in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equal with God: but when the Jews sought to kill him because he *made himself equal with God*[39], he answered them, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:* but that

John xvi. 15.

John v. 26.

John v. 18, 19.

37 Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστὶν, ὡς ἔμπαλιν τὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τοῦ πατρός· οὐδὲν οὖν ἴδιον, ὅτι κοινὰ, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι κοινὸν καὶ ὁμότιμον, εἰ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio.* [Orat. xxx. 11. p. 547 A.]

38 'Hoc dixit, *Vitam dedit Filio ut haberet eam in semetipso*, tanquam diceret, Pater, qui est vita in semetipso, genuit Filium qui esset vita in semetipso. Pro eo enim quod est *genuit*, voluit intelligi *dedit*, tanquam si cuiquam diceremus, dedit tibi Deus esse.' *S. August.* [Tract. xix. in Joh. §. 13. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 443 D.] Et paulo post, 'Quid ergo Filio dedit? dedit ei ut Filius esset; genuit ut vita esset; hoc est, dedit habere ei vitam in semetipso, ut esset vita non egens vita, ne participando intelligatur habere vitam. Si enim participando haberet vitam non in semetipso, posset et amittendo esse sine vita: hoc in Filio ne accipias, ne cogites, ne credas. Manet ergo Pater vita, manet et Filius vita. Pater vita in semetipso, non a Filio; Filius vita in semetipso, sed a Patre.' [Ibid.] So again, *de Trin. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. 'Plerumque dicit, *Dedit mihi Pater;* in quo vult intelligi quod eum genuerit Pater: non ut tanquam jam existenti et non habenti dederit aliquid, sed ipsum dedisse ut haberet, genuisse est ut esset.' [§. 26. vol. viii. p. 766 E.]

39 'Tamquam diceret, Quid scandalizati estis quia Patrem meum dixi Deum, quia æqualem me facio Deo? Ita sum æqualis, ut non ille a me, sed ego ab illo sim. Hoc enim intelligitur in his verbis, *Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam*, &c. hoc est, quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? quia a Patre habet ut possit, quia a Patre habet ut sit. Filio enim hoc est esse quod posse.' *S. August. in locum.* [Tract. xx. in Joh. §. 4. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 450 C.] Paulo post, 'Hoc est, *Non potest Filius a se quicquam facere*, quod esset, si diceret, non est Filius a se. Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo natus est.' [Ibid. §. 8. p. 452 C.]

connexion of his operations, shewing the reception of his essence; and by the acknowledgment of his power, professing his substance from the Father. From whence he which was equal, even in that equality professeth a priority, saying, *The Father* 135
John xiv. 28. *is greater than I*[40]: the Son equal in respect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the Godhead. *I know him,* saith Christ, *for I am from him.* And because he is from the Father, therefore he is called by those of the Nicene Council, in their Creed, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God*[41]. The Father is God, but not of God, Light, but not of Light; Christ is God, but of God, Light, but of Light. There is no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, because the same in both; but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself, from none; Christ hath the same not of himself, but from him.
John vii. 29.

And being the Divine nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged co-essential[42], of the same substance

[40] Δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μεῖζον μέν ἐστι τῆς αἰτίας· τὸ δὲ ἴσον, τῆς φύσεως. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 36. [Orat. xxx. 7. p. 544 D.]

[41] So St. Augustin hath observed: '*Ab ipso,* inquit, *sum,* quia Filius de Patre, et quicquid est filius, de illo est cujus est filius: ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo; Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum: et dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine; Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen: ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, *Ab ipso sum.*' [Tract. xxxi. in Joh. §. 4. vol. iii. p. 521 F.] From hence then did the Nicene Council gather those words of their Creed, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. [Mansi ii. 916 B. Socr. i. 8. p. 21.] But not immediately, for they were partly in some of the Oriental Creeds before; as appeareth by that confession which Eusebius presented to the Council, as containing what he had believed and taught ever since his baptism, in which he had these words, Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς. [Socr. p. 23.] And as Eusebius calls him *Life of Life,* so others *Power of Power,* and *Wisdom of Wisdom.* 'Ideo Christus virtus et sapientia Dei, quia de Patre virtute et sapientia etiam ipse virtus et sapientia est, sicut lumen de Patre lumine, et fons vitæ apud Deum Patrem, utique fontem vitæ.' *S. August. de Trin.* lib. vii. *cap.* 3. [§. 4. vol. viii. p. 856 C.] And not only so, but *Essence of Essence.* 'Pater et Filius simul una sapientia, quia una essentia; et singillatim sapientia de sapientia, sicut essentia de essentia.' *Ibid. cap.* 2. [§. 3.]

[42] Ὁμοούσιος, which is *co-essential* or *consubstantial,* is not to be taken of a part of the Divine essence, as if the Son were a part of the essence of the Father, and so of the same nature with him, which was the opinion of the Manichees. Οὐχ ὡς Οὐαλεντῖνος προβολὴν τὸ γέννημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐδογμάτισεν· οὐδ' ὡς Μανιχαῖος μέρος ὁμοούσιον τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ γέννημα εἰσηγήσατο· as Arius in his epistle to Alexander. [Epiph. Hær. LXIX. §. 7. vol. i. p. 732 D.]: by the interpretation of St. Hilary; 'Nec ut Valentinus, prolationem natum Patris commentatus est—nec, sicut Manichæus, partem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit.' *De Trin. lib.* vi. *cap.* 9. [p. 883 A, 884 B.] 'Quod Hilarius ita Latine reddidit;

with the Father; as the Council of Nice determined, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him; *I and the Father are one:* John x. 30. where the plurality of the verb, and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons, speak a perfect identity of

tanquam ὁμοούσιον id significaret quod *partem substantiæ* habet ex toto resectam,' says Dionysius Petavius, without any reason; [de Trin. lib. iv. c. 5. §. 8.] for St. Hilary clearly translates ὁμοούσιον barely *unius substantiæ*, and it was in the original μέρος ὁμοούσιον, which he expressed by *partem unius substantiæ*. Under this notion first the Arians pretended to refuse the name ὁμοούσιον, as Arius in the same epistle signifieth, lest thereby they should admit a real composition and division in the Deity: Εἰ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον,—ὡς μέρος τοῦ ὁμοουσίου καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπὸ τίνων νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἔσται ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ διαιρετὸς, καὶ τρεπτός. [Epiph. vol. i. p. 733 C.] And St. Jerom testifies thus much, not only of Arius and Eunomius, but also of Origen before them. 'Habetur Dialogus apud Græcos Origenis, et Candidi Valentinianæ hæreseos defensoris, in quo duos Andabatas digladiantes inter se spectasse me fateor. Dicit Candidus, Filium de Patris esse substantia, errans in eo quod προβολήν, id est, *prolationem*, asserit: e regione Origenes, juxta Arium et Eunomium, repugnat eum vel prolatum esse vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes.' *Apol.* ii. *in Ruffin.* [§. 19. vol. ii. p. 512 A.] And therefore Eusebius Bishop of Cæsarea refused not to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away. Τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, ὡμολόγητο πρὸς αὐτῶν δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, οὐ μὲν ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ Πατρός. [Socr. H. E. i. c. 8. p. 25.] Upon this confession he subscribed to that clause, *Begotten of the substance of the Father*, which was not in his own Creed. And again, Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν ἐξεταζόμενος ὁ λόγος συνίστησιν, οὐ κατὰ τῶν σωμάτων τρόπον, οὔδε τοῖς θνητοῖς ζώοις παραπλησίως· οὔτε γὰρ κατὰ διαίρεσιν τῆς οὐσίας, οὔτε κατὰ ἀποτομήν, &c. [Ibid.] Upon this acknowledgment he was persuaded to subscribe to the other clause also, (added to that Creed which he himself gave in to the Council,) *Being of one substance with the Father:* which clause was inserted by the Council at the instance of Constantine the emperor. Now as the Manichees made use of the word ὁμοούσιος to express their errors concerning the nature of God, and the person of Christ; so the ancient Fathers, before the Nicene Council, had used the same in a true catholic sense, to express the unity in essence of the Father and the Son: as appeareth by the confession of the same Eusebius; Ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινὰς λογίους καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ συγγραφέας ἔγνωμεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ θεολογίας τῷ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου συγχρησαμένους ὀνόματι. [Ibid.] Wherefore the other Eusebius of Nicomedia, understanding the ancient catholic sense, confessed that if they believed Christ to be the true begotten, and not created, Son of God, they must acknowledge him ὁμοούσιον, which the Arians endeavoured to make so odious, and therefore the Council in opposition to them determined it: 'Quid est aliud cur ὁμοούσιον Patri nolint Filium dici, nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium confiteri? sicut auctor ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis epistola sua prodidit, scribens, Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium et increatum dicimus, ὁμοούσιον cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta esset epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quia id viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hæreseos amputarent.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib.* iii. *cap.* 15. [§. 125 vol ii. p. 518 E.] De voce Ὁμοούσιος *vide Dionys. Petav. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 5, 6.]

their essence. And though Christ say, *The Father is in me, and I in him;* yet withal he saith, *I came out from the Father;* by the former shewing the Divinity of his essence, by the latter the origination of himself. We must not look upon the Divine nature as sterile[43], but rather acknowledge and admire the fecundity and communicability of itself, upon which the creation of the world dependeth[44]; God making all things by his Word, 136 to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of our third assertion, that the Father hath communicated the Divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus, who is the Christ.

John x. 38. John xvi. 28.

The fourth assertion followeth, that the communication of the Divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and Christ, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the Father, is the eternal Son of God. That God always had a Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the Proverbs of Solomon; *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?* And it was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater than another, and Mahomet might persuade his credulous disciples that he was greater than any of the sons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternal Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to prefer himself before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his Alcoran[45], that God hath no

Prov. xxx. 4.

43 Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν εἰπεῖν ἔρημον τῆς φυσικῆς γονιμότητος. *Damasc. de Fide Orthod. lib.* i. *cap.* 8. [vol. i. p. 133 B.]

44 Εἰ δὲ μὴ καρπογόνος ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ θεία οὐσία, ἀλλ' ἔρημος, κατ' αὐτοὺς, ὡς φῶς μὴ φωτίζον, καὶ πηγὴ ξηρὰ, πῶς δημιουργικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἔχειν αὐτὸν λέγοντες οὐκ αἰσχύνονται; *S. Athanas. Orat.* ii. *cont. Arianos.* [§. 2. vol. i. p. 470 A.]

45 This is often repeated there, and particularly in the last chapter but one, called *Alechlas.* 'Est ipse Deus unus, Deus æternus, qui nec genuit, nec genitus est, et cui nullus est æqualis.' [Marracio, Ref. Alcorani, i. 831.] And the *Saracenica* set forth by Sylburgius [p. 2, l. 25.] mention this as the first principle of Mahometanism, Ὅτι εἷς Θεός ἐστι, ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων, μήτε γεννηθείς, μήτε γεννήσας. [c. i. p. 2.] And Joannes Siculus and Georgius Cedrenus relate how Mahomet gave command, Ἕνα μόνον προσκυνεῖν Θεὸν, τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν τιμᾶν ὡς λόγον Θεοῦ οὐχ ὡς υἱὸν δέ. [Hist. Byz. vol. vii. p. 333 C.] And we read of his ridiculous history, that Christ, after his ascension into heaven, was accused by God for calling himself his Son, and that he denied it, as being so named only by men without any authority from him. Ὅτι ἀνελθόντα τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠρώτησεν ὁ Θεὸς, λέγων, Ὦ Ἰησοῦ, σὺ εἶπες τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, Ὅτι υἱός εἰμι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεός· καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ὅτι οὐκ εἶπον ἐγὼ, οὐδὲ αἰσχύνομαι εἶναι δοῦλός σου· ἀλλ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν ὅτι εἶπον τὸν λόγον τοῦτον. [Sylb. Sarac. p. 5.]

such Son, nor any equal with him: and his disciples have corrupted the Psalm of David[46], reading (instead of *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,*) *Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee.* The later Jews[47], acknowledging the words, and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so unto David, as that they deny them to belong to Christ; and that upon no other ground, than that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians' confession. But by the consent of the ancient Jews, by the interpretation of the blessed Apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense to him alone. *For, unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* as the Apostle argues. And if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the Apostle's argument had been none at all.

Psalm ii. 7.

Heb. i. 5.

Now that the communication of the Divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper

46 Alfirozabadius in his *Kamuz*: 'Dictum Dei omnipotentis ad Jesum, (cui propitius sit et pacem concedat Deus) Tu es *Nabiya*, Propheta meus, ego *walladtoca*, fovi te; at dixerunt Christiani, Tu es *Bonaiya*, Filius meus, ego *waladdtoca*, te genui. Longe est supra hæc Deus. And to the same purpose Ebnol Athir: In Evangelio dixit Isæ, Ego *walladtoca, i. e.* educavi te; at Christiani, dempta litera Lam altera, ipsum ei filium statuerunt. Qui longe elatus est super ea quæ dicunt.' [Marracio, Prodromi in Alcoranum, P. iii. §. 15. p. 49.] Whereas then the Apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahometans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messias, were forced to corrupt the text: and for that they pretend the eminency and excellency of the Godhead, as if it were beneath the majesty of God to beget a Son, or be a Father: and indeed whosoever would bring in another prophet greater than Christ, as he was than Moses, must do so.

47 I say the later Jews so attribute those words to David, as if they belonged not to the Messias; but the ancient Jews understood them of the Christ; as appeareth not only out of those places in the Evangelists where *the Christ* and *the Son of God* are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jews themselves, who have confessed no less. So Rabbi David Kimchi in the end of his Commentaries on the second Psalm, ויש מפרשין זה המזמור על גוג ומגוג ומשיח הוא מלך המשיח וכן פירשו רבותינו ז"ל: *Some interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the anointed is Messias the King; and so our doctors of happy memory have expounded it.* And Rabbi Solomon Jarchi not only confesseth that the ancient Rabbins did interpret it of the Messias, but shews the reason why the later Jews understood it rather of David, that thereby they might the better answer the argument of the Christians deduced from thence: רבותינו דרשו את הענין על מלך המשיח ולפי משמעו ולתשובת המינים נכון לפותרו על דוד עצמו: *Our doctors have expounded it of the Messias: but as to the literal sense, and for the answering heretics,* (that is, in their language, *Christians,*) *it is rather to be interpreted of David in his own person.* [The words לתשובת המינים are omitted in the later Rabbinic Bibles, but are found in Bomberg's, 1525, and in the MS. spoken of above, Opp. 34, f. 243. R P.S.]

generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear: because the most proper generation which we know, is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same human nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of paternity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolifical benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply*, Adam *begat in his own likeness, after his image:* and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of human generations hath been continued. This then is the known confession of all men[48], that a son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same Divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internal nature, the other in reference to the external form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the latter accidental; not only sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. The similitude then, in which the propriety of generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in the identity of nature[49]: and this communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence Christ is called *the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.*

137

Gen. i. 28; v. 3.

2 Cor. iv. 4. Heb. i. 3.

Nor is this communication of the Divine essence only the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it far

48 Κοινὸν ὑπάρχει πᾶσι καὶ αὐτοδίδακτον ὁμολόγημα, ὡς ἅπας υἱὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τῷ γεγεννηκότι οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως. *Phot. Epist.* I. [p. 4.] This is in the language of Aristotle [de Anima II. 4. §. 3.] Τὸ ποιῆσαι ἕτερον οἷον αὐτό· ζῷον μὲν ζῷον, φυτὸν δὲ φυτόν. And St. Basil, *lib.* ii. *cont. Eunom.* [§. 22. vol. i. p. 258 D.] Πατὴρ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν, ὁ ἑτέρῳ τοῦ εἶναι κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἑαυτῷ φύσιν τὴν ἀρχὴν παρασχών.

49 'Etiamsi filius hominis, homo, in quibusdam similis, in quibusdam sit dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est, negari verus filius non potest, et quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substantiæ non potest.' *S. August. cont. Maximin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 15. [§. 2. vol. viii. p. 711 A.]

more proper than any natural generation of the creature, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the Divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below: so in the communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent: but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal: whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself; for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality wholly to be removed, when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being always Father, as always God. Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolifical; in God eternal perfection sheweth his eternal
138 fecundity[50]. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence; the power of generation depending on the first prolifical benediction, *Increase and multiply*, it must be made by way of multiplication, and thus every son becomes another man. But the Divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity uncapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which

50 Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἤδη τέλεια γεννᾷ· τὸ δὲ ἀεὶ τέλειον ἀεὶ καὶ ἄϊδιον γεννᾷ. *Euseb. de Præp. Evang. ex Plotino.* [xi. c. 17.] Ἀνθρώπων μὲν γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ γεννᾶν, διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τῆς φύσεως· Θεοῦ δὲ ἀΐδιον τὸ γέννημα, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ τέλειον τῆς φύσεως. *S. Athanas. Orat.* i. *cont. Arianos.* [§. 14. vol. i. p. 419 A.] This was it which so much troubled the Arians, when they heard the Catholics constantly asserting, ἀεὶ Θεὸς, ἀεὶ υἱός· ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱός.

proceedeth by that communication hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; Abraham man, and Isaac man: but Abraham one man, Isaac another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same nature which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generations: it followeth that this communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of St. Peter's confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God;* this the ground of our Saviour's distinction[51], *I go unto my Father, and to your Father.* Hence did St. John raise a verity, more than only a negation of falsity, when he said, we *are in the true Son:* for we which are in him are true, not false sons, but such sons we are not as *the true Son.* Hence did St. Paul draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he *spared not his own* proper *Son.* Thus have we sufficiently shewed, that the eternal communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation by which Christ Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth assertion.

Matt. xvi. 16.

John xx. 17.

1 John v. 20.

Rom. viii. 32.

The fifth and last assertion followeth, that the Divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other person naturally begotten by the Father; and in that respect Christ is the *only-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will first be necessary to inquire into the true notion of the *only-begotten;* and then shew how it belongs particularly to Christ, by reason of the Divine nature communicated by way of generation to him alone. First, therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient heretics[52],

51 'Multum distat inter dominationem et conditionem, inter generationem et adoptionem, inter substantiam et gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum aut Deum nostrum: sed, ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum, ad Deum meum et ad Deum vestrum. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, aliter nobis. Illum siquidem natura coæquat, misericordia humiliat: nos vero natura prosternit, misericordia erigit.' *Capreolus Carthag. Epist.* [Galland. ix. p. 496 C.]

52 'This was the fallacy which Eunomius endeavoured to put upon the Church, as appears by those words of his delivered and answered by St.

who would have the restraining term *only* to belong, not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the *only-begotten* were no more than *begotten* of the Father *only*. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common custom of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any.

Secondly, we must by no means admit the exposition of the
139 later heretics[53], who take the *only-begotten* to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, when we know that he had Ishmael beside; and Solomon said to be the *only-begotten before his mother*, when David had other children even by the mother

Basil, [cont. Eunom. ii. 20. vol. i. p. 255 D.] Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ, φησὶ, μονογενὴς, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ μόνου τῆ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου δυνάμει γεννηθεὶς καὶ κτισθεὶς τελειότατος γέγονεν ὑπουργός, as if μονογενὴς were only παρὰ μόνου, and *unigenitus* were nothing else but *genitus ab uno*. This St. Basil refuteth copiously; first, from the language of the Scriptures and the usage of mankind; Διὰ τὴν πανουργίαν, ἣν περὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐκακούργησε, παρά τε τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνήθειαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν εὐσεβῆ τῶν γραφῶν παράδοσιν ἐκλαμβάνων αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. Μονογενὴς γὰρ οὐχ ὁ παρὰ μόνου γενόμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνος γεννηθεὶς, ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χρήσει προσαγορεύεται. [Ibid. p. 256 A.] Secondly, by a retort peculiar to that heresy, which held the Son of God might be called κτισθεὶς as well as γεννηθεὶς, *created* as well as *begotten*, and consequently might be as properly named μονόκτιστος as μονογενὴς. Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνος γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ παρὰ μόνου μονογενὴς εἴρηται, ταὐτὸ δέ ἐστι κατά σε τὸ ἐκτίσθαι τῷ γεγεννῆσθαι, τί οὐχὶ καὶ μονόκτιστον αὐτὸν ὀνομάζεις; Thirdly, by a particular instance shewing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called μονογενὴς, because not begotten of one, but two parents. Μονογενὴς δὲ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς κατά γε τὸν ὑμέτερον λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ πᾶσιν ὑπάρχειν τὴν γέννησιν· οὐδὲ ἡ Σάρρα μήτηρ μονογενοῦς ἦν παιδὸς, διότι οὐχὶ μόνη αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, ἐτεκνώσατο. [Ibid.]

53 The Socinians make very much of this notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternal generation. So the Racovian Catechism: 'Causa cur Christo ista attributa (sc. *proprium et unigenitum Dei Filium esse*) competant, hæc est: quod inter omnes Dei filios et præcipuus sit, et Deo charissimus: quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus et hæres exstitit, *unigenitus* vocatus est, *Heb.* xi. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; et Solomon *unigenitus coram matre sua*, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint.' 1 *Paral.* iii. 1, 2, 3, &c. [sect. iv. c. i. p. 84.] And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schlichtingius hath inserted it as a material observation; 'Nam hic *unicus* seu *unigena* filius nominatur, qui cæteris longe carior est Patri, longeque præstantior;' and confirms the interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the *Son of God*, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the only-begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the only-begotten, as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their parents. Or if Christ were the only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this interpretation was invented, that when all the rest should fail they might stick to this.

of Solomon. For the *only-begotten* and the *most beloved* are not the same; the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other; and the same cannot be cause and effect to itself. For though it be true, that the only son is the beloved son; yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved, because the only, not therefore the only, because beloved. Although therefore Christ be the only begotten and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other; his unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, Isaac was called the only son of Abraham for some other reason than because he was singularly beloved of Abraham; for he was the only son of the free-woman, the only son of the promise made to Abraham, which was first this, *Sarah shall have a son*, and then, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called.* So that Isaac may well be called the only son of Abraham in reference to the promise, as the Apostle speaks expressly; *By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son.* Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of the *only-begotten;* we must look upon it in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the term restrictive *only* shall have relation not only to the Father generating[54], but also to the Son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. It is true, the Father spake from heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;* and thereby we are to understand, that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father, are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ

Gen. xviii. 14; xxi. 12.

Heb. xi. 17.

Mark i. 11.

54 Eunomius would have it only παρὰ μόνου, in relation to the Father only. St. Basil shews that no way proper, and shews that μονογενής is not he which παρὰ μόνου but μόνος γεγέννηται. St. Cyril of Alexandria adds these two παρὰ μόνου and μόνος together, in relation to the Father and the Son: Μονογενὴς κατὰ φύσιν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ὠνόμασται λόγος, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου γεγέννηται τοῦ πατρός. *Epist.* 1. *ad Regin.* as Ruffinus doth in *unicus:* 'Ideo subjungit unicum hunc esse Filium Dei.—Unus enim de uno nascitur.' *Expos. Symb.* [§. 6. p. cciv.] St. Gregory Nazianzen adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: Μονογενὴς δὲ, οὐχ ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου καὶ μόνον, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μονοτρόπως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ σώματα. [Orat. xxx. 20. p. 554 A.] So he something obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen: Λέγεται μονογενὴς, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς μόνως ἐγεννήθη· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁμοιοῦται ἑτέρα γέννησις τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννήσει, οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἄλλος υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. [De Fide Orthod. i. 8. vol. i. p. 135 A.]

is the only-begotten Son of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a far more near relation the natural and eternal Son.

Having thus declared* the interpretation of the word, that properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the only-begotten, but he who alone is so begotten: we shall proceed to make good our assertion, shewing that the Divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

140 And here we meet with two difficulties: one shewing that there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the Divine essence was communicated, and then the communication of that to the Word made him not the only-begotten; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such communication necessary to found such a filiation: the other, alleging that the same Divine essence may be communicated to another beside the Word, and not only that it may, but that it is so, to the person of the Holy Ghost; whence either the Holy Ghost must be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the only-begotten; or if he be not the Son, then is not the communication of the Divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of sonship. These two objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate this last assertion.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the Sons of God, and that we call the same God *our Father*, which Christ called his; that *both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren:* we confess that those whom St. Paul *hath begotten through the Gospel* may well be termed the *begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them*[55]: but withal,

Heb. ii. 11.

1 Cor. iv. 15.

1 John iii. 9.

* [In the first edition, it is *cleared.*]

[55] Ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. 1 John iii. 9. And more expressly, 1 John v. 1. Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα, ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ. *Quisquis credit Jesum esse Christum illum, ex Deo*

we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the generation of the Son. We are first generated, and have our natural being[56]; after that regenerated, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and by virtue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of adoption, shewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphorical: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his generation clearly excludeth the name of adoption[57]; and not

genitus est; et quisquis diligit eum qui genuit, diligit etiam eum qui ex eo genitus est.

56 'Nos genuit Deus ut filii ejus simus, quos fecerat ut homines essemus. Unicum autem genuit, non solum ut filius esset, quod Pater non est, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod et Pater est.' *S. August. de Consensu Evang. lib.* ii. *cap.* 3. [§. 7. vol. iii. part 2. p. 30 A.] In the book of Celsus there was a Jew introduced speaking thus to Christ, Εἰ τοῦτο λέγεις, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ θείαν πρόνοιαν γεγονὼς υἱός ἐστι Θεοῦ, τί ἂν σὺ ἄλλου διαφέρῃς; who is thus answered by Origen; Πρὸς ὃν ἐροῦμεν, ὅτι πᾶς μὲν ὁ, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ὠνόμασε, μηκέτι ὑπὸ φόβου παιδαγωγούμενος, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν αἱρούμενος, υἱός ἐστι Θεοῦ· οὗτος δὲ πολλῷ καὶ μακρῷ διαφέρει παντὸς τοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν χρηματίζοντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅστις ὥσπερεὶ πηγή τις καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν τοιούτων τυγχάνει. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* i. [§. 57. p. 371 F.]

57 First, it is most certain that the Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the natural, Son of God. 'Non est Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus connuncupatus, sed Deus verus.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* v. *cap.* 5. [p. 857 D.] 'Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptione.' *Concil. Tolet.* xi. [Mansi xi. p. 133 C.] Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι φύσει, καὶ οὐ θέσει, γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πατρός. *S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech.* xi. [§. 7. p. 152 A.] And again, Οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρήγαγεν, οὐδὲ τὸν μὴ ὄντα εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἤγαγεν· ἀλλ' ἀΐδιος ὢν ὁ πατὴρ, ἀϊδίως ἐγέννησε καὶ ἀνεκφράστως υἱὸν ἕνα μόνον, ἀδελφὸν οὐκ ἔχοντα. [*Ibid.* §. 14. p. 156 A.] This hath been so generally confessed, that Felix and Elipandus, who were condemned for maintaining Christ as man to be the adopted Son of God, did acknowledge it, as appeareth by the beginning of their book. 'Confitemur et credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum, coæternum et consubstantialem, non adoptione sed genere.' [Mansi xiii. p. 884 E.] Secondly, it is also certain, that the man Christ Jesus taken personally is the natural, not the adopted, Son of God: because the man Christ Jesus is no other person than the Word, who is the eternal and natural Son, and by subsisting in the human nature could not leave off to be the natural Son. The denial of this by Felix and Elipandus was condemned as heretical in the Council of Francford; [*Ibid.* p. 909 C.] and their opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of St. Augustin, partly in their own additions. 'Confitemur et credimus eum factum ex muliere factum sub lege; non genere esse Filium Dei, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratia:' [p. 885 A.] this they maintained by forged testimonies of some Fathers, and by the Liturgy of the Church of Toledo, composed by Hildephonsus, as the Roman by Gregory; in the Mass *de Cœna Domini*, 'Qui per adoptivi hominis passionem dum suo non indulsit corpori.'—And in the Mass *de Ascensione Domini*, 'Hodie Salvator noster, per adoptionem carnis, sedem repetivit Deitatis.' [p. 886 C.] To this the Synod opposed their determination *in Sacrosyllabo*; '*Quod ex te nascetur sanctum vocabitur filius Dei,*

only so, but when he becometh the Son of Man, even in his humanity refuseth the name of an adopted Son. For *when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law,* (not that he, but) *that we might receive the adoption of sons.* He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren; he whom in the sacred Scriptures the Spirit
141 nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own, sometimes his beloved, but never his adopted[58] Son; he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is distinguished from us[59], who can claim no higher filiation than that which we receive by the privilege of adoption; he is truly the *only-begotten Son* of God, notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his Word; and the reason why he is so is, because the Divine essence was communicated unto him in his natural and eternal generation, whereas only the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our adoption. Indeed if we were begotten of the essence* of God as Christ was, or he were only by the grace of God adopted[60], as Gal. iv. 4, 5.

non adoptivus sed verus, non alienus sed proprius.' And again; 'Porro adoptivus dici non potest, nisi is qui alienus est ab eo a quo dicitur adoptatus: et gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio præstatur: sicut nos aliquando cum essemus peccando filii iræ, alieni eramus a Deo, per proprium et verum Filium, qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est.' [p. 876.] And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodic Epistle; 'Unitas personæ quæ est in Dei filio et filio Virginis adoptionis tollit injuriam†.' [p. 893 A.]

58 'Legi et relegi Scripturas, Jesum Filium Dei nusquam adoptione inveni.' *Ambrosiaster Com. in Ep. ad Rom.* 'Dices mihi, Cur times adoptivum Christum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, quia nec Apostoli eum sic nominarunt, nec sancta Dei et Catholica Ecclesia consuetudinem habuit sic eum appellare. *Synod. Epist. Concil. Francoford.* [Mansi xiii. p. 895 B.] From whence they charge all those to whom they write that Synodic Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures; 'Intelligite, fratres, quæ legitis, et nolite nova et incognita nomina fingere, sed quæ in S. Scriptura inveniuntur tenete, &c.'

59 St. Augustin hath observed, that St. Paul made use of *υἱοθεσία*, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. 'Aut vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sua non nos genuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utique dilectione adoptavit. Quo verbo Apostolus sæpe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, nisi ad discernendum Unigenitum.' *De Consensu Evang. lib.* ii *.cap.* 3. [§. 6. vol. iii. part 2. p. 29 C.] And St. Ambrose takes notice that the name of *true* destroyeth that of *adopted:* 'Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium esse natura, sed eum dicimus natura esse qui verus est filius.' *De Incarn. Sacr. cap.* 8. §. 87. [vol. ii. p. 723 A.]

60 'Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus,

* [In the first edition, it is *substance.*]

† [The following texts may be quoted as proving Jesus Christ to be the begotten, and not the adopted, Son of God: John iii. 16—18. Rom. viii. 3, 32. Gal. iv. 4. Heb. iii. 5, 6. 1 John iv. 9.]

we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the *only Son*, by reason of so many brethren: but being we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the latter, it remaineth we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by virtue of his natural and peculiar generation, to be the *only-begotten Son*.

But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the Divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the Divine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the only Son? To this I answer, That the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession: and though every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten [61]. Wherefore in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the Church [62], the Holy Ghost is never said to

dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non potest dici.' *Concil. Francoford.* [Mansi xiii. p. 893 A.] 'Quod si etiam unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen et veritatem unigeniti perdidit, postquam fratres habere jam cœpit: privatur enim hujus veritate nominis, si in unigenito non est de Patre veritas naturalis.' *Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib.* iii. *cap.* 3. [p. 114.] 'Si divina illa Filii sempiternaque nativitas non de natura Dei Patris, sed ex gratia, creditur substitisse, non debet unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genitus. Quoniam sicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternæ contribuit, sic eum ab unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tributa communio paternæ adoptionis exclusit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis.' *Ibid. cap.* 4.

61 'Non omne quod procedit nascitur, quamvis omne procedat quod nascitur.' *S. August. cont. Maxim. lib.* ii. *cap.* 14. [§. 1. vol. viii. p. 703 D.] who gives the same solution to the same argument: 'Quæris a me, *Si de substantia Patris est Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus Filius sit, et alius non sit Filius?* Ego respondeo, sive capias, sive non capias; De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus Sanctus, sed ille genitus, iste procedens.' [*Ibid.*] Πολλῷ τούτου πιθανώτερον, τὸ φάναι ἐξ ἐκείνου γε τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φῦναι τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸ πανάγιον πνεῦμα· τὸν μὲν, ὡς λόγον, ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ γεννώμενον· τὸ δὲ, ὡς πνεῦμα, ἐκπορευόμενον· ξυμπρόεισι γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐ ξυγγεννώμενον, ἀλλὰ ξυνὸν καὶ παρομαρτοῦν, καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον. *Theodoret. Serm.* ii. [vol. iv. p. 504 B.]

62 'Nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filius natus, a quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est Filius.' *Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm.* [c. i. p. 75 A.]

be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the Son, but the gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam: whereas Seth proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the Son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of
142 production; Eve descending not from Adam as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the regeneration and adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternal generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible Divine essence; seeing he had not that Divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any[63], we must also acknowledge him the *only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son; from the adopted children, as the natural Son.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation the *only Son*, appeareth first in the confirmation of our faith concerning the redemption of mankind. For this doth shew such an excellency and dignity in the person of the Mediator,

'Deus Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo hoc est, ex Patre, Spiritus Sanctus innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre.' *Isaac. lib. Fidei.* [Galland. vii. p. 597 B.] 'Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus Sanctus est, qui a Patre et Filio procedit,' *S. Ambros. in Symb.* [sive de Trinitate, c. 3. vol. ii. App. p. 323 A.]

63 Ὡς μὲν οὖν υἱὸς, φυσικῶς κέκτηται τὰ τοῦ πατρός· ὡς δὲ μονογενὴς, ὅλα ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ συλλαβὼν, οὐδενὸς καταμεριζομένου πρὸς ἕτερον. *S. Basil. Homil. de Fide.* [§. 2. vol. ii. p. 132 B.]

as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his sufferings. We know *it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins:* and we may very well doubt how the blood of him, who hath no other nature than that of man, can take away the sins of other men; there appearing no such difference as will shew a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be *bought with a price,* well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently *precious,* when we are assured that it is the *blood of God:* nor can we question the efficacy of it in *purging our conscience from dead works,* if we believe *Christ offered up himself through the eternal Spirit.* If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender; because the more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion; and therefore every offence committed against him must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injury. Again, as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended; so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying; because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injury was eclipsed; and all honour doth increase proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied than by a belief in such a Mediator as is the only-begotten Son of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Heb. x. 4.

1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23: 1 Pet. i. 19. Acts xx. 28. Heb. ix. 14.

Secondly, the belief of the eternal generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian in ascribing that honour and glory unto Christ which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son, which is truly and

1 13

properly Divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who *hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* As it was represented to St. John in a vision, when he *heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.* Again, we are commanded *to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him*[64]; and that with such an emphasis, as by *him* we are to understand him alone, because *the Lord our God is one Lord.* From whence, if any one arose among the Jews, teaching under the title of a prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgment of the Rabbins was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as Moses wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that one God only must be worshipped, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid only under the Law, as if then there were only one God to be worshipped, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, *Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only, if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. *When* the Scripture *bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, it saith, Let all the angels of God worship him;* but then the same Scripture calleth that first-begotten *Jehovah*[65], and *the Lord of the whole earth.* For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and gross idolatry: to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not in the same degree, but the same sin: to worship him as God who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be

John v. 22, 23. Rev. v. 13. Deut. x. 20. Deut. vi. 4. Moses Maim. Præf. in Seder Zeraim. Matt. iv. 10. Heb. i. 6. Ps. xcvii. 5.

64 The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely ועבדו *et servies ei*, but ואתו תעבד *et ipsi servies*, with such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by the Chaldee Paraph. וקדמוהי תסלח *et in conspectu ejus servies;* by the LXX. καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις· and that restriction approved by our Saviour, Matt. iv. 10.

65 Εἰ δὲ μονογενής ἐστιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἐστιν, οὐδεμίαν ἄρα ἔχει πρὸς τὰ κτιστὰ κοινωνίαν. *Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. lib.* v. *cap.* 2. [vol. iv. p. 253 C.]

thought an act in the formality void of idolatry. Lest therefore, while we are all obliged to give unto him Divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhor, it is no less than necessary that we should believe that Son to be that eternal God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom only we should serve.

Thirdly, Our belief in Christ as the eternal Son of God is necessary to raise us unto a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite love of God, appearing in the sending of his only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extolled and admired by the Apostles. *God so loved the world,* saith St. John, *that he gave his only-begotten Son. God commendeth his love towards us,* saith St. Paul, *in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;* in that *he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. In this,* saith St. John again, *was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* If we look upon all this as nothing else, but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of his love in this way of redemption, more than would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. It is true indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation; and 144
considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God, even in the act of redemption itself; but yet the Apostles have raised that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in the choosing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation, by sending his only-begotten into the world; by not sparing his own Son; by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of God's love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension unto such a suffering condition; and the nearer his relation to the

John iii. 16.

Rom. v. 8. viii. 32.

1 John iv. 9, 10.

Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the dignity of the person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the person sent; then it is absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal.

By this discourse in way of explication every Christian may understand what it is he says, and express his mind how he would be understood, when he maketh this brief confession, I believe in Christ *the only Son* of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no less than this; I do profess to be fully assured of this assertion as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Messias, is the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God.* And as I assert him so to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kind of sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation: and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation; all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so only by adoption, as it is natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son.

Our Lord.

AFTER our Saviour's relation founded upon his eternal generation, followeth his dominion in all ancient Creeds[66], as

66 For though in the first rules of faith mentioned by Irenæus and Tertullian we find not *Dominum nostrum,* yet in all the Creeds afterward we find those words; probably inserted because denied by the Valentinians, of whom

the necessary consequent of his filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be *our Lord*, because the only Son must of necessity be heir and Lord of all in his Father's house; and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or angels, if compared to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of Christ.

Three things are necessary, and more cannot be, for a plenary 145
explication of this part of the Article. First, the proper notation of the word *Lord* in the Scripture-phrase, or language of the Holy Ghost: Secondly, the full signification of the same in the adequate latitude of the sense, as it belongs to Christ: Thirdly, the application of it to the person making confession of his faith, and all others whom he involves in the same condition with himself, as saying, not *my*, nor *their*, but *our Lord*.

[a] Mark xvi. 19, 20. Luke xii. 42. xxiv. 34. John iv. 1. vi. 23. xi. 2. xx. 2, 18, 20, 25. xxi. 7. Acts ix. 1, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 31, 42. xi. 16, 24. xiii. 47. &c. Κύριος.

[b] Matt. xxviii. 6.

First then, we must observe that not only Christ is *the Lord*, but that this title doth so properly belong unto him, that *the Lord* alone absolutely taken is frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles[a] determinately for *Christ*, insomuch that the angels observe that dialect[b], *Come, see the place where the Lord lay*. Now for the true notation of the word, it will not be so necessary to inquire into the use or origination of the Greek[67], much less into the etymology of the correspondent

Irenæus, Διὰ τοῦτο τὸν Σωτῆρα λέγουσιν, οὐδὲ γὰρ Κύριον ὀνομάζειν αὐτὸν θέλουσι. *lib.* i. *cap.* 1. [§. 3. p. 7.]

67 For whosoever shall consider the signification of Κύριος in the Scriptures, I think he will scarce find any footsteps of the same in the ancient Greeks. In our sacred Writ it is the frequent name of God; whereas I imagine it is not to be found so used by any of the old Greek authors. Julius Pollux, whose business is to observe what words and phrases may be properly made use of in that language, tells us the gods may be called Θεοί or Δαίμονες, but mentions not Κύριος, as neither proper, nor any name of God with them at all. Nor did they anciently use it in their œconomics; where their constant terms were, not κύριος, but δεσπότης and δοῦλος, and they had then another kind of notion of it, as appears by the complaint of the servant in Aristophanes:

Τοῦ σώματος γὰρ οὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν κύριον
Κρατεῖν ὁ δαίμων, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐωνημένον.
Plut. v. 7.

In which words, if they were interpreted by the Scripture usage, κύριος would signify *the master*, and ἐωνημένος the person *bought*, that is, the servant; whereas the place requires an interpretation wholly contrary; for ἐωνημένος is not here ἠγορασμένος, but ἀγοράσας, or ὠνησάμενος, as the Scholiast, Suidas, and Moschopulus have observed, that is, not the servant, but the master who bought him. And though those grammarians bring no other place to prove this active signification beside this of Aristophanes, by which means it might be still questionable whether they had rightly interpreted him without any au-

Latin, as to search into the notion of the Jews, and the language of the Scriptures, according unto which the Evangelists and Apostles spake and wrote.

And first, it cannot be denied but that the word, which we translate *the Lord,* was used by the interpreters of the Old Testament sometimes for men[68], with no relation unto any other than human dominion. And as it was by the translators of the Old, so is it also by the penmen of the New[69]. But it is most

thority; yet Phrynichus will sufficiently secure us of this sense. Ἔτυχον ἐωνημένος οἰκίαν ἢ ἀγρόν. ἐνταῦθα οὐδὲν ἐγχωρεῖ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίασθαι, μένει τὸ ἐωνημένος δόκιμον. Ἐωνημένος then here is he which buyeth, that is, the master; and consequently κύριος not the master, but the servant bought, whom he supposeth originally to have power over his own body. Indeed it was not only distinguished, but in a manner opposed to δεσπότης, as appears by that observation of Ammonius, thus delivered by Eustathius in *Odyss.* ξ'. [v. 146.] Κύριος γυναικὸς καὶ υἱῶν ἀνὴρ καὶ πατήρ· δεσπότης δὲ ἀργυρωνήτων.

68 As אדון is generally translated κύριος when it signifieth *lord* or *master* in respect of a servant or inferior. So Sarah called her husband, Gen. xviii. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 6. so Eliezer his master Abraham, Gen. xxiv. frequently. Thus Rachel saluteth her father Laban, Gen. xxxi. 35. and Jacob his brother Esau, Gen. xxxiii. 8. Potiphar is the κύριος of Joseph whom he bought, Gen. xxxix. 2, &c. and Joseph in power is so saluted by his brethren, Gen. xlii. 10. and acknowledged by his servant, xliv. 5. The general name in the Law of Moses for *servant* and *master* is παῖς and κύριος, Exod. xxi. 2, 4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signify no more than human power, that we find אדם the name of man so translated, as 1 Sam. xvii. 32. אל־יפל לב־אדם עליו: Μὴ δὴ συμπεσέτω καρδία τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπ' αὐτόν.

69 For κύριος is used with relation, and in opposition, to παιδίσκη, Acts xvi. 16. in the sense in which the later, not the ancient, Greeks used it: Παιδίσκη, τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπίνης οἱ νῦν τιθέασιν· οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος, as Phrynichus observes. As it is opposed to οἰκέτης, Luke xvi. 13. (according to that of *Etymol.* Κύριος τῶν πρός τι ἐστὶν, ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸν οἰκέτην) to δοῦλος, Matt. x. 24. xviii. 25, &c. and in the Apostolical rules pertaining to Christian œconomics, the master and servant are δοῦλος and κύριος. As also by way of addition, κύριος τοῦ θερισμοῦ. Matt. ix. 38. κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. Matt. xx. 8. κύριος τῆς οἰκίας. Mark xiii. 35. insomuch as κύριε is sometimes used by way of address or salutation of one man to another, (as it is now generally among the later Greeks, and as *dominus* was anciently among the Latins; 'Quomodo obvios, si nomen non occurrat, Dominos salutamus.' *Sen.* Ep. iii.) not only of servants to masters, as Matt. xiii. 27. or sons to parents, as Matt. xxi. 30. or inferiors to men in authority, as Matt. xxvii. 63. but of strangers; as when the Greeks spake to Philip, and desired him, saying, Κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν. John xii. 21. and Mary Magdalen speaking unto Christ, but taking him for a gardener, Κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτόν. John xx. 15. And it cannot be denied but this title was sometimes given to our Saviour himself in no higher or other sense than this: as when the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him than that he appeared to be one of the Jews, she said, Κύριε, οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ. John iv. 11; and the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him, Κύριε, ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω. John v. 7; the blind man, to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith, Τίς ἐστι, κύριε; and Πιστεύω, κύριε. John ix. 36, 38.

certain that Christ is called Lord, in another notion than that which signifies any kind of human dominion; because, as so, 1 Cor. viii. 5; ver. 6. and Eph. iv. 5. Col. iii. 22. 1 Cor. ii. 8. xv. 47. Rev xix. 16. *there are many lords*, but he is in that notion Lord which admits of no more than *one*. They are only *masters according to the flesh*; he *the Lord of glory, the Lord from heaven, King of kings, and Lord of* all other *lords*.

Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of the 146
Law in the most high and full signification; for it is most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for *El* or *Elohim*, sometimes for *Shaddai* or the *Rock*, often for *Adonai*, and most universally for *Jehovah*, the undoubted proper name of God, and that to which the Greek translators, long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of Lord, not only by way of explication, but distinction and particular expression. As when we read, *Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high in all the earth:* and when God so Ps. lxxxiii. 18. Exod. vi. 3. expresseth himself, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them.* In both these places, for the name *Jehovah*, the Greek translation, which the Apostles followed, hath no other name but *Lord*; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate *the Lord*[70] did they

70 I know it is the vulgar opinion, that Κύριος properly answereth unto אדני, and the reason why it was also used for יהוה, is no other than because the Jews were wont to read *Adonai* in the place of *Jehovah*. Of which observation they make great use who deny the divinity of Christ. 'Quia enim *Adonai* pro *Jehovah* in lectione Hebræorum verborum substitui consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur.' says Crellius *de Deo et Attrib.* cap. 14. [vol. iv. p. 35.] But first it is not probable that the LXX. should think Κύριος to be the proper interpretation of אדני, and give to it *Jehovah* only in the place of *Adonai*; for if they had, it would have followed, that where *Adonai* and *Jehovah* had met together in one sentence, they would not have put another word for *Adonai*, to which Κύριος was proper, and place Κύριος for *Jehovah*, to whom of itself (according to their observation) it did not belong. Whereas we read not only אדני יהוה translated Δέσποτα Κύριε. Gen. xv. 2, 8. and האדון יהוה צבאות Ὁ δεσπότης Κύριος Σαβαώθ. Isa. i. 24. but also יהוה אדנינו Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Nehem. x. 29. Secondly, the reason of this assertion is most uncertain; for though it be confessed that the Masoreths did read אדני where they found יהוה and Josephus before them expresses the sense of the Jews of his age, that the τετραγράμματον was not to be pronounced, and before him Philo speaks as much; yet it followeth not from thence, that the Jews were so superstitious above 300 years before; which must be proved before we can be assured that the LXX. read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*, and for that reason translated it Κύριος. Thirdly, as we know no reason why the Jews should so confound the names of God, so were it now very irrational in some places to read אדני for יהוה; as when God saith, Exod. vi. 3. *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob,* באל שדי ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם, though the

understand the proper name of God, *Jehovah:* and had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifest intention of the Spirit: for it cannot be denied but God was known to Abraham by the true importance of the title *Adonai,* as much

vulgar translation render it, *In Deo omnipotente, et nomen meum Adonai non indicavi eis,* and thereby make an apparent sense no way congruous to the intended importance of the Holy Ghost (for it cannot be imagined either that God should not be known to Abraham by the name *Adonai,* or that it were any thing to the present intendment, which was to encourage Moses and the Israelites, by the interpretation of the name *Jehovah*); yet we have no reason to believe that the LXX. made any such heterogeneous translation, where we read Καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου Κύριος οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς. Thus again, where God speaks unto Moses, Οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν ὄνομα αἰώνιον. Exod. iii. 15. whosoever thinks Κύριος stands for *Adonai* does injury to the translators; and whosoever readeth *Adonai* for *Jehovah* puts a force upon the text. As also when the prophet David saith, *That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth.* Ps. lxxxiii. 18. I confess the ancient Fathers did, together with the Jews, read *Adonai* for *Jehovah* in the Hebrew text; as appeareth by those words of Epiphanius *de Ponderibus* [§.6.p.163D.] Ἀδωναΐ ἠλιχὰ, καριθὶ, ἰσμαὴλ, ἰεββιτὰ ἀκώλ· which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of the 141st Psalm, יהוה קראתיך חושה לי האוינה קולי but plainly enough render יהוה Ἀδωναΐ. Notwithstanding it is very observable, that they were wont to distinguish Κύριος in the Greek translations, where it stood for *Jehovah,* from Κύριος, where it stood for *Adonai;* and that was done by adding in the margin the *tetragrammaton* itself, יהוה, which, by the ignorance of the Greek scribes, who understood not the Hebrew characters, was converted into four Greek letters, and so made a word of no signification, ΠΙΠΙ. This is still extant in the copy of the text of Isaiah printed by Curterius with the Commentary of Procopius, and St. Jerom gives an account of it in the Greek copies of his age; 'Nomen τετραγράμματον, quod ἀνεκφώνητον, id est, ineffabile putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur, *jod* י *he* ה *vau* ו *he* ה; quod quidam non intelligentes, propter elementorum similitudinem, cum in Græcis libris repererint, *Pipi* legere consueverunt.' *Epist.* 136. [Ep. xxv. vol. i. p.129 C.] Neither did the Greeks only place this ΠΙΠΙ in the margin of their translations, but when they described the Hebrew text in Greek characters, they used the same ΠΙΠΙ for יהוה, and consequently did not read *Adonai* for *Jehovah.* An example of this is to be found in that excellent copy of the prophets according to the LXX., collated with the rest of the translators, in the library of the most eminent Cardinal Barberini; where at the 13th verse of the 2d chapter of Malachi these words are written after the translation of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, out of the Hebrew text, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla, of which there is an excellent example in that MS. Οὐζωθ, σηνιθ, θεσου, χεσσουθ, δεμα, ἐθμαζβην, (l. βηκ) πιπι, βεχι, ουανακα, μηην, ωδ, φεννωθ, ελ, αμμανα, ουλακεθ, ρακων, μειδηχεμ, which are a very proper expression of these following Hebrew words, according to the punctuation and reading of that age, וואת שנית תעשו כסות דמעה את־מזבח יהוה בכי ואנקה מאין עוד פנות אל־המנחה ולקחת רצון מידכם: By which it is evident that Origen in his Hexapla, from whence undoubtedly that ancient Scholiast took his various translations, did not read Ἀδωναΐ in that place; but kept the Hebrew characters, which they who understood them not formed into those Greek letters πιπι. And certainly the preserving of the name *Jehovah* in the Greek translations was very ancient, for it was described in some of them with the ancient characters, as

as by the name of *Shaddai;* as much by his dominion and sovereignty, as by his power and all-sufficiency; but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of his promises, 147 his name *Jehovah* was not known unto him: for though God spake expressly unto Abraham, *All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever;* yet the history teacheth us, and St. Stephen confirmeth us, that *he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, though he promised that he would give it to him for a possession.* Wherefore when God saith he was not known to Abraham by his name *Jehovah,* the interpretation of no other name can make good that expression: and therefore we have reason to believe the word which the first Greek translators, and after them the Apostles, used, may be appropriated to that notion which the original requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the same signification with the Hebrew root[71], and so

Gen. xiii. 15. xxvi. 3. Acts vii. 5.

St. Jerom testifieth; 'Et nomen Domini *tetragrammaton* in quibusdam Græcis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum literis invenimus.' *Epist.* 106. Being then we cannot be assured that the LXX. read אדני for יהוה; being they have used Κύριος for *Jehovah,* when they have made use of the general word Θεός for *Adonai;* being in some places *Adonai* cannot be read for *Jehovah,* without manifest violence offered to the text; it followeth, that it is no way probable that Κύριος should therefore be used for *Jehovah,* because it was taken for the proper signification of *Adonai.*

71 It is acknowledged by all that יהוה is from הוה or היה, and God's own interpretation proves no less, אהיה אשר אהיה Exod. iii. 14. and though some contend that futurition is essential to the name, yet all agree the root signifieth nothing but essence or existence, that is, τὸ εἶναι, or ὑπάρχειν. Now as from הוה in the Hebrew יהוה, so in the Greek ἀπὸ τοῦ κύρειν, Κύριος. And what the proper signification of κύρειν is, no man can teach us better than Hesychius, in whom we read κύρει, ὑπάρχει, τυγχάνει. κύρω prima longa, κυρῶ prima brevi. *Sophocl. Œdip. Colon.* v. 1158:

——Παρ' ᾧ
Θύων ἔκυρον——

Schol. Θύων ἔκυρον, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκύρουν, ταὐτὸν δὲ τῷ ἐτύγχανον. Hence was κύροι by the Attics used for ἔστω *sit:* so I take it from the words of the Scholiast upon Sophocles, [Ajax, 314.] Τὸ κυρῶ περισπωμένως φησὶν ἡ συνήθεια καὶ Ἀττικοί, ἐν δὲ εὐκτικοῖς βαρύνουσιν αὐτὸ Ἀττικοὶ μετὰ ἐκτάσεως τοῦ υ, κύροι λέγοντες ἀντὶ τοῦ κυροίη. Not that they used it by an apocope, taking η from κυροίη, but that κύροι was taken in the sense of κυροίη or κυροῖτο, from κύρω, ὑπάρχω, κύροι, εἴη or ὑπάρχοι, as the Scholiast upon those words of Sophocles, *Elect.* v. 849.

Δειλαία δειλαίων κυρεῖς,
Κυρεῖς, ἤγουν ὑπάρχεις.

Neither know I better how to render κυρεῖς than by ὑπάρχεις in that place of Æschylus's Prometheus, v. 330;

Ζηλῶ σ' ὀθούνεκ' ἐκτὸς αἰτίας κυρεῖς,
Πάντων μετασχὼν καὶ τετολμηκὼς ἐμοί.

As the Arundelian Scholiast upon the *Septem Thebana,* κυρεῖ, ὑπάρχει, and in the same tragedy, ἐπ' ἀσπίδος κυρεῖν, is rendered by the more ancient Scholiast, εἶναι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος, as in the *Persæ,* σεσωσμένος κυρεῖ, is by the same interpreter explained κυρεῖ καὶ ὑπάρχει σεσωσμένος. So the same poet in his Agamemnon, v. 1379:

Ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι,
Τρανῶς Ἀτρείδην εἰδέναι κυροῦνθ' ὅπως.

Which the Scholiast renders thus, Ἐπαινοῦμαι διαφόρως ταύτην γνώμην, τὸ μαθεῖν

denoting the essence or existence of God, and whatsoever else may be deduced from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

ἐν οἵᾳ ἐστὶ καταστάσει ὁ βασιλεύς. And no other sense can be imagined of that verse in Sophocles, *Œdip. Tyrann.* v. 362,

Φονέα σε φημὶ τἀνδρὸς οὗ ζητεῖς κυρεῖν,

than by rendering it εἶναι or ὑπάρχειν· and *Œdip. Colon.* v. 726,

———Καὶ γὰρ εἰ γέρων κυρῶ,
Τὸ τῆσδε χώρας οὐ γεγήρακε σθένος·

and, *Philoct.* v. 899,

Ἀλλ' ἐνθάδ' ἤδη τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους κυρῶ·

or of that in Euripides, *Phœnissæ*, v. 1074,

Ὦ τί, τίς ἐν πύλαισι δωμάτων κυρεῖ;

This original interpretation appeareth farther in the frequent use of κυρέω for τυγχάνω, as it signifieth no more than *sum:* as in Sophocles, εὐθύνων κυρεῖς for εὐθύνεις, μισῶν κυρῆς for μισῇς, ἐπεικάζων κυρῶ for ἐπεικάζω, ὢν κυρεῖς for εἶς, ἐξειδὼς κυρῶ for ἔξοιδα, κυρῶ λεύσσων for λεύσσω, δρῶν κυρεῖς for δρᾷς, ἠπατημένος κυρῶ for ἠπάτημαι, εἰρηκὼς κυρεῖ for εἴρηκεν, εἰπὼν κυρεῖς for εἶπας, ἐκύρει ζῶσα for ἔζη, and in Euripides, ἔχων κυρεῖ for ἔχει, εἰσβαίνουσα κυρεῖ for εἰσβαίνει, ἠδικημένη κυρῇ for ἀδικῆται, or ἀδικηθῇ, as the Scholiast. From all which it undeniably appeareth, that the ancient signification of κύρω or κυρῶ is the same with εἰμί, or ὑπάρχω, *sum, I am:* (which is much confirmed by that it was anciently observed to be a verb transitive, as it was used by the forementioned author, Κυρῶ συζυγίας πρώτης τῶν περισπωμένων, τὸ περιτυγχάνω· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ὑπάρχω κατὰ τοὺς τραγικοὺς ἀμετάβατον. So an ancient Lexicon;) and therefore Κύριος immediately derived from thence must be ὁ ὤν, or ὁ ὑπάρχων; and consequently the proper interpretation of יהוה descending from the root הוה of the same signification. And well may we conceive the LXX. for this reason to have so translated it, because we find the origination delivered by them in that notion, rendering אהיה ὁ Ὤν, Exod. iii. 14. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ὤν, and again, ὁ Ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. From whence considering the name יהוה proceeding from that root, and given in relation to that sense, they made use of the word Κύριος for the standing interpretation of that name, as being equivalent to ὁ Ὤν. We have no reason then to conceive either that they so translated it out of the superstition of the Jews, (as some would persuade us, whom we have already refuted,) or because they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could express the Hebrew name, whereas we find it often expressed even among the Gentile Greeks; but because they thought the Greek Κύριος to be a proper interpretation, as being reducible to the same signification. For even they which are pretended to have read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*, as Origen, &c. do acknowledge that the heathens and the ancient heretics descending from the Jews had a name by which they did express the Hebrew *Jehovah*. We know that oracle preserved by Macrobius, *Saturnal. lib.* i. *cap.* 18.

Φράζεο τὸν πάντων ὕπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν Ἰαώ.

And Diodorus hath taught us from whence that name first came, mentioning Moses in this manner, Παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσὴν τὸν Ἰαὼ ἐπικαλούμενον Θεόν· and Theodoret more expressly, *Quæst.* 15. *in Exod.* [vol. i. p. 86 B.] Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρεῖται μὲν Ἰαβὲ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰαώ. Porphyrius, *lib.* iv. *cont. Christian.* tells us, Sanchoniathon had his relations of the Jews παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως Θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰευώ. Eusebius (as we formerly mentioned) said, Ἰωσουέ ἐστιν Ἰαὼ σωτηρία· [Dem. Evang. iv. 17.] Hesychius, Ἰωάθαμ, Ἰαὼ συντέλεια, taking ἰω in composition for the contraction of Ἰαώ. As Ἰωνὰς ἑρμηνεύεται, ὑψίστου πονοῦντος. And the LXX., Jer. xxiii. 6. have rendered יהוה צדקנו Ἰωσεδέκ, id est, *Dominus justus*, saith St. Jerom. And as the heathens and the first Christians, so the heretics had among them the pronunciation and expression of the name יהוה. As the Valentinian was baptized ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαώ. *Iren. lib.* i. [c. xxi. §. 3. p. 96.] and the Ophiani had their several gods, among the rest, ἀπὸ

Being then this title *Lord* thus signifieth the proper name of 148
God *Jehovah*, being the same is certainly attributed unto Christ in a notion far surpassing all other lords, which are rather to be looked upon as servants unto him: it will be worth our inquiry next, whether, as it is the translation of the name Jehovah, it belong to Christ; or whether though he be Lord of all other lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferior unto him whose name alone is Jehovah, as that in that propriety and eminency in which it belongs unto the supreme God it may not be attributed unto Christ.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the name Jehovah itself to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the original name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that original. Wherefore if Christ be the Jehovah, as so called by the Spirit of God; then is he so the Lord, in the same propriety and eminency in which Jehovah is. Now whatsoever did belong to the Messias, that may and must be attributed unto Jesus, as being the true and only Christ. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that Jehovah shall be known clearly in the days of the Messias, and not only so, but that it is the name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confess so much, who only read the prophecies, as the Eunuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see *Jehovah the Lord of hosts* to be the name of the Messias, who was to them *for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence*, how can we possibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by St. Paul, that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, *As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a*

As Midrasch Tillim on xxi. Psal. Echa Rabati, Lam. i. 6.

Isa. viii. 13, 14.

Rom. ix. 33.

μὲν μαγείας τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ καὶ τὸν Ἀσταφαῖον, καὶ τὸν Ὠραῖον· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν γραφῶν τὸν Ἰαὼ, Ἰὰ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὀνομαζόμενον. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* vi. [§. 32. vol. i. p. 656 E.] So I read it, not as it is in the edition of Hœschelius, Ἰαωΐα in one word, or Ἰαωΰα, as our learned countryman Nicolaus Fullerus hath endeavoured in vain to rectify it; but *Iaὼ Iá*, that is, the Ophiani took the name Ἰαώ from the Jews, among whom it signifies the same who is called *Iah*. For that it ought so to be read appeareth by the former words of Origen, Οἴονται τὸν διελθόντα τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ καὶ φθάσαντα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰὰ δεῖν λέγειν, Σὺ δὲ κρυπτομένων μυστηρίων υἱοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἄρχων νυκτοφαὴς δεύτερε Ἰαώ. [Ibid. §. 30. p. 655 B.] In the printed copy indeed it is *Iaδεῖν*, and in the Latin *Iadin*, but without sense; whereas dividing the words, the sense is manifest, and the reason of the former emendation apparent. Being then there were so many among the Greeks which did in all ages express the Hebrew name, it can be no way probable that the LXX. should avoid it as inexpressible in their language.

stumblingstone, and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed? It was no other than Jehovah who spake those words, *I will have mercy upon the house of Judah,* Hos. i. 7. *and will save them by the Lord* (Jehovah) *their God, and will not save them by bow nor by sword*[72]. Where not only he who is described as the original and principal cause, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, and that in opposition to all other means or instrumental causes, is called Jehovah; who can be no other than our Jesus, because *there is no other name under heaven given unto* Acts iv. 12. *men whereby we must be saved.* As in another place he speaketh, *I will strengthen them in the Lord* (Jehovah), *and they shall walk* Zech. x. 12. *up and down in his name, saith the Lord* (Jehovah); where he which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personal pronoun, and yet each of them is *Jehovah,* and *Jehovah our God is* Deut. vi. 4.
149 *one Jehovah.* Whatsoever objections[73] may be framed against

72 Hos. i. 7. where it is farther observable that the Chaldee Paraphrase hath במימרא דיי ביהוה for *by the word of Jehovah,* for *Jehovah.*

73 Two adversaries we have to the exposition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; only with this difference, that we find the less opposition from the Jew, from whom indeed we have so ample a concession as will destroy the other's contradiction. First Socinus answers, the name belongeth not to Christ, but unto Israel; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same prophet, Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16. *Socin. Refut. Jac. Wieki, cap.* 6. *Catech. Racov. de Pers. Christi, cap.* 1. *Crellius de Deo et Attrib. lib.* i. *cap.* 11. To this we first oppose the constant interpretation of the Jews, who attribute the name *Jehovah* to the Messias from this one particular text. As in the *Sepher Ikkarim, lib.* ii. *c.* 8. ויקרא הנכתוב שם המשיח יי" צדקנו *The Scripture calleth the name of the Messias Jehovah our righteousness.* And in *Midrasch Tillim* on Psalm xxi. [fol. 16. col. 1.] ויקרא למלך המשיח בשמו ומהו שמו יהוה שנ" יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה שמו ובמלך המשיח כתיב וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו God *calleth the Messias by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as it is said,* (Exod. xv. 3.) *The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messias,* (Jer. xxiii. 6.) *And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness.* Thus *Echa Rabati,* Lam. i. 16. [fol. 58. col. 2.] מה שמו של משיח אר" אבא יהוה שמו שנ" וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו *What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name; as it is said* (Jer. xxiii. 6.) *And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness.* The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. The Rabbins then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literal importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name *Jehovah* did belong to the Messias. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to inforce the same interpretation. For whereas in Jerem. xxiii. 6. it is expressly said, וזה שמו *this is the name;* in the xxxiii. 16. it is only וזה without any mention of a name; and surely that place cannot prove *Jehovah* to be the name of Israel, which speaks not one word of the name of Jerusalem: for where we read in Crellius, 'hoc scilicet nomen est,' all but *hoc* is not Scripture, but the gloss of Crellius, and *hoc* itself cannot be warranted for the interpretation of זה, nor *quo* for

Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

us, we know Christ is the *righteous branch raised unto David, the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely;* we are assured that *this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness:*

אשר; the simplest interpretation of those words וזה אשר יקרא לה being, *iste qui vocabit eam,* he which calleth Jerusalem is the Lord our righteousness, that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid: which he easily foreseeing, hath joined with the Jewish Rabbins in the second answer, admitting that *Jehovah our righteousness* is the name of the Messias, but withal denying that the Christ is that Jehovah. To which purpose they assert those words, *Jehovah our righteousness,* to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition; and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to infer as much. As *Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi,* Exod. xvii. 15. *Gideon built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah Shalom,* Judg. vi. 24. And the name of the city in the last words of Ezekiel is *Jehovah Shammah.* In all which places it is most certain, that the name *Jehovah* is not predicated of that, of whose name it is a part; but is the subject of a proposition, given by way of nomination, whose verb substantive or *copula* is understood. But from thence to conclude, that *the Lord our righteousness* can be no otherwise understood of Christ than as a proposition, and that we by calling him so, according to the prophet's prediction, can understand no more thereby than that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For first, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a proposition of themselves, because *Jehovah* cannot be the predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent that an altar or a city built cannot be God: and whatsoever is not *Jehovah* without addition, cannot be *Jehovah* with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given; and our adversaries, who teach that the name *Jehovah* is sometimes given to the angels representing God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ, whom they confess to be above all angels, and far more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, That which is the addition in those names cannot be truly predicated of that thing which bears the name. Moses could not say that altar was his exaltation, nor Gideon that it was his peace. And if it could not so be predicated by itself, it could neither be by apposition, and consequently, even in this respect, it was necessary to make the name a proposition. But *our righteousness* may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of *the Lord our righteousness;* for the Apostle hath expressly taught us, that he *is made righteousness unto us,* 1 Cor. i. 30. And if it may be in itself, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly, that addition of *our righteousness* doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person called Jehovah but to that Christ alone. For he alone *is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth,* Rom. x. 4, and when he is said to be *made unto us righteousness,* 1 Cor. i. 30, he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being then Christ is thus peculiarly called our *righteousness* under the Gospel, being the place of the prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the Gospel, being no other person called Jehovah is ever expressly called *our righteousness* in the Gospel; it followeth, not only that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be fulfilled, than by acknowledging that Christ is *the Lord our righteousness:* and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both Jehovah and our righteousness, he is as truly Jehovah as our righteousness.

the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of *our Righteousness* can be no diminution to his majesty. If those words in the Prophet, *Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord* (Jehovah), did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much; *And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee:* for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ? Zech. ii. 10, 11.

And as the original *Jehovah* was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets, so the title of *Lord*, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signal prediction of the first age of the Gospel, God promised by Joel, that *whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord* (Jehovah) *shall be delivered:* and St. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence, that *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed;* and inferring from that, *if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved.* For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed;* and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved*, then must *the Lord* in the thirteenth verse of the tenth chapter to the Romans be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse; or else St. Paul's argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises. But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other than Jehovah, as appeareth by the prophet Joel from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of Jehovah. Joel ii. 32. Rom. x. 9, 11, 13.

If we consider the office of John the Baptist peculiar unto
150 him, we know *it was he of whom it is written* in the Prophet Malachi, *I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me:* we are sure he which spake those words was (*Jehovah*) *the Lord of hosts;* and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord, before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way. *The voice* Matt. xi. 10. Mal. iii. 1. Isa. xl. 3.

of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith Isaiah, *Prepare ye the*
Matt. iii. 3. *way of the Lord* (Jehovah): and *this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Isaiah,* saith St. Matthew: this is he of whom his
Luke i. 76. father Zachariah did divinely presage, *Thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways:* where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord undeniably[74] Jehovah.

74 I say therefore *undeniably,* because it is not only the undoubted translation of the name יהוה in the prophet (which of itself were sufficient), but also is delivered in that manner which is (though unreasonably) required to signify the proper name of God, *προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου,* not *τοῦ Κυρίου,* that is, without, not with, an article. For now our Saviour's Deity must be tried by a new kind of school divinity, and the most fundamental doctrine, maintained as such ever since the Apostles' times by the whole Catholic Church, must be examined, censured, and condemned, by *ὁ, ἡ, τό.* Socinus first makes use of this observation against Wiekus; and after him Crellius hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its several corners, to uphold the fabric of his superstructions. First, 'Vox *Jehovah* magis quam cætera Dei nomina propriorum naturam sequitur; ideo etiam Græca Κύριος, cum pro illa ponitur, propriorum indolem, qua licet, æmulatur.' Secondly, 'Propriis nominibus articulus libentius subtrahitur, licet eum etiam sæpe concinnitatis potius quam necessitatis causa admittant. Idem fit in voce Κύριος cum pro *Jehovah* ponitur.' Thirdly, 'Hæc est causa cur in Novo Testamento, maxime apud Lucam et Paulum, vox Κύριος, cum Deum summum designat, articulo libentius careat; at cum de Christo subjective usurpatur, raro articulus omittitur.' [Crellius *de Deo* &c. c. 14.] What strange uncertainties are these to build the denial of so important an article as Christ's Divinity upon? He does not say absolutely *Jehovah* is the proper name of God, but only that it doth more follow the nature of proper names than the other names of God. And indeed it is certain that sometimes it hath the nature of an appellative, as Deut. vi. 4. יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד *The Lord our God is one Lord;* and yet if it be not always and absolutely a proper name, though all the rest were granted to be true, the argument must be of no validity. Again, he cannot say an article is never affixed to a proper name, but only that *libentius subtrahitur,* it is rather omitted than affixed; which yet is far from a certain or a true rule, especially in the language of the New Testament. For no man can deny *Jesus* to be the proper name of Christ, given him according to the Law at his circumcision, *καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς.* Luke ii. 21; and yet whosoever shall read the Gospel of St. Matthew, will find it ten times *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* with an article, for once *Ἰησοῦς* without it. And in the Acts of the Apostles, written in a more Attic style, St. Paul is oftener styled *ὁ Παῦλος* than simply *Παῦλος.* So Balaam, Gallio, &c. Some persons we find in the New Testament, whom, if we should stay till we found them without an article, we should never call by their names at all; as Apelles, Balak, &c. Thirdly, *ὁ Κύριος* is so often used for that God who is the Father with an article, and *Κύριος* for the Son without an article, (for the Father, Matt. i. 22. ii. 15. v. 33. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke i. 6, 9, 15, 25, 46. ii. 15, 22, 23. x. 2. Acts ii. 25, 34. iii. 19. xvii. 27. Rom. xv. 11. 1 Cor. x. 26. xvi. 7. 2 Cor. v. 11. Eph. v. 17, 19. Col. iii. 16, 20, 23. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. i. 16. Heb. viii. 2, 11. xii. 14. Jam. iv. 10, 15. 1 Pet. ii. 3. For the Son, Matt. iii. 3. xxii. 43, 45. Mark i. 3. Luke i. 76. ii. 11. iii. 4. xx. 44. John i. 23. Acts ii. 36. x. 36. xi. 16, 21. xv. 11. Rom. i. 7. x. 9, 12. xiv. 6, 8, 14. xvi. 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22. 1 Cor. i. 3. iv. 17. vii. 22, 25, 39. ix. 1, 2. x. 21. xi. 11. xii. 3. xiv. 37. xv. 58. xvi. 10, 19. 2 Cor. i. 2. ii. 12. iv.

Nor is this the only notation of the name or title *Lord*, taken in a sense Divine, above the expression of all mere human power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so is it also for that of *Adon* or *Adonai*. *The Lord said unto my Lord*, saith David, that is, in the original, *Jehovah* unto *Adon*; and that *Adon* is *the Word*, that *Lord* is *Christ*. We know the temple at Jerusalem was the temple of the most high God, and the Lord of that temple in the
151 emphasis of an Hebrew article was Christ, as appeareth by that prophecy: *The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in.* Ps. cx. 1. Chaldee Paraphrase. Mal. iii. 1. הארון

Now this notation, as it is the interpretation of *Adon*, signifieth immediately and properly *dominion*, implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not only agree

5. x. 17. xi. 17. xii. 1. Gal. i. 3. v. 10. Eph. i. 2. ii. 21. iv. 1, 5, 17. v. 8. vi. 1, 4, 10, 21, 23. Phil. i. 2, 14. ii. 11, 19, 24, 29. iii. 1, 20. iv. 1, 2, 10. Col. i. 2. iii. 17, 18, 24. iv. 1, 7, 17. 1 Thess. i. 1. iii. 8. iv. 1, 15, 17. v. 2, 12. 2 Thess. i. 1, 2. ii. 13. iii. 4. 1 Tim. i. 1. 2 Tim. ii. 24. Tit. i. 4. Philem. 3, 16, 20. Jam. i. 1. 2 Pet. iii. 8, 10. 2 John 3. Jude 14. Rev. xiv. 13. xix. 16. I say, they are thus so often used,) that though they equal not the number of their contrary exceptions, yet they come so near, as to yield no ground for any such observation, as if the Holy Ghost intended any such article-distinction. Nay, it is most evident that the sacred penmen intended no such distinction, because in the same place speaking of the same person, they usually observe the indifferency of adding or omitting the article. As Jam. v. 11. Τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος Κυρίου εἴδετε, ὅτι πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων. 2 Tim. i. 18. Δῴη αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εὑρεῖν ἔλεος παρὰ Κυρίου ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. 1 Cor. vii. 17. Ἕκαστον ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ Κύριος, οὕτω περιπατείτω. 22. Ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος, ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου ἐστί. See Rom. xiv. 6, 7, 8. Wherefore being *Jehovah* is not affirmed absolutely to be a proper name; being, if it were, yet it appears that it is not the custom of the New Testament to use every proper name oftener without an article than with one; being ὁ Κύριος is so often taken for him whom they acknowledge God, and Κύριος for him whom they cannot deny to be the Christ: it followeth that Christ, acknowledged to be the Lord, cannot by any virtue of an article be denied to be the true Jehovah. We must not then think to decide this controversy by the articles, of which the sacred penmen were not curious, and the transcribers have been very careless; nor is there so great uncertainty of the ancient MSS. in any thing, as in the words and articles of Κύριος and Θεός. The vulgar edition, Rev. i. 8. hath λέγει ὁ Κύριος only, the Complutensis λέγει Κύριος ὁ Θεός, Plantine, λέγει ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεός, against the Socinian rule, who will have an accession by ὁ to Θεός, and a diminution by ὁ from Κύριος. As Rev. iv. 11. Ἄξιος εἶ, Κύριε, λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν: in other MSS. Ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιος, λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν. 1 Cor. xi. 27.—τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, others with an addition, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου. 1 Cor. xiv. 37. the vulgar edition—ὅτι τοῦ Κυρίου εἰσὶν ἐντολαί, the Complutensis, ὅτι Κυρίου. So where we usually read Χριστός, divers ancient MSS. have Κύριος. Lastly, it is observable that even in these words of the Creed, which we now expound, Κύριος is spoken expressly of Christ without an article, for so we read it, Καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Κύριον ἡμῶν.

with that other notion of Jehovah, but presupposes it, as following and flowing from it. For he who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself, must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all: because every thing must necessarily belong to him, from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being Christ is the Lord, as that title is taken for Jehovah, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth, that he be acknowledged also the Lord, as that name expresseth *Adon*, signifying power authoritative and proper dominion. Thus having explained the notation of the word *Lord*, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition, we come next to the second, which is, to declare the nature of this dominion, and to shew how and in what respect Christ is *the Lord*.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the dominion seated or invested in Christ as the Lord, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his Divinity, the other bestowed upon his humanity; one, as he is the Lord the Maker of all things, the other as he is made Lord of all things.

John i. 1, 3. For the first, we are assured that the *Word was God*, that by the same Word *all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made;* we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the Creator of all things must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creator, who made all things. Therefore the Word, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universal dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting, but believing Thomas, *My Lord and my God.*

John xx. 28.

For the second, it is also certain that there was some kind of lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very unction proves no less than an imparted dominion; as St. Peter tells us, that he was *made both Lord and Christ.* What David spake of man, the Apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, *Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.*

Acts ii. 36.

Heb. ii. 7, 8.

Now a dominion thus imparted, given, derived, or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God, as God, founded in the Divine nature, because whatsoever is such is absolute and independent. Wherefore this lordship thus imparted or acquired appertaineth to the human nature, and belongeth to our Saviour as the Son of Man. The right of judicature is part of this power; and Christ himself hath told us, that the Father *hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man;* and by virtue of this delegated authority, the *Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and reward every man according to his works.* Part of the same dominion is the power of forgiving sins; as pardoning, no less than punishing, is a branch of the supreme magistracy: and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy, (*Thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins.*) Another branch of that power is the alteration of the Law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter, which is to make a law: and Christ asserted himself
152 to be *greater than the temple,* shewing that the *Son of Man was Lord even of the sabbath day.*

John v. 27. Matt. xvi. 27. Matt. ix. 2, 6. Matt. xii. 6, 8.

This dominion thus given unto Christ in his human nature was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true that *Jesus knew,* before his death, *that the Father had given all things into his hands;* yet it is observable that in the same place it is written, that he likewise knew *that he was come from God, and went to God:* and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not only so, but also to reward him. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* After his resurrection he said to his disciples, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head.* Because *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Thus for and

John xiii. 3. Rom. xiv. 9. Mat. xxviii. 18 Ps. cx. 7. Phil. ii. 8, 9, 10, 11.

after his death he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of Man, but exalted by the Father, who *raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church.*

Eph. i. 20, 21, 22.

Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession; so neither, when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely economical, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and terminate, when that end for which it was given shall be accomplished: part, being either due upon the union of the human nature with the divine, or upon covenant, as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternal.

Of the first part of this dominion did David speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he called his Son his Lord; *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool:* where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged until their final and total subjection: *for he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet.* And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdom till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. For *when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* Thus he which was appointed to *rule in the midst of his enemies* during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

Ps. cx. 1.

1 Cor. xv. 25.

1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

Ps. cx. 2.

But we must not look upon Christ only in the nature of a general, who hath received a commission, or of an ambassador, with perfect instructions, but of the only Son of God, impowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's kingdom: and though thus impowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the only Son and the Heir of all things in his Father's house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath pur-

chased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward
153 which was assigned him for his sufferings: for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcescible crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath always reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings; but so that he continue still for ever High Priest and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternal dominion of Christ, as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people; *I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it.* Now the promise was thus made expressly to David, *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* And although that term *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signify ofttimes no more than a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things; and so the economical dominion or kingdom of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfil that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that economy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all: and that it is so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the Angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her womb; *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise, than in Daniel's prevision of the performance, who *saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was*

Ez. xxxiv. 23, 24.

2 Sam. vii. 16.

עד עולם

Luke i. 32, 33.

Dan. vii. 13, 14.

given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent dominion, as God, the Creator, and consequently the Owner of the works of his hands: and by a derived, imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ: which authority so given and bestowed upon him is partly economical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the human nature, that it must be coeval with it, that is, of eternal duration.

The third part of our explication is, the due consideration of the object of Christ's dominion, inquiring whose Lord he is, and how *ours*. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are
Acts x. 36. comprehended, as subjected to it. For *he is Lord of all*, saith St. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection
1 Cor. xv. 27. implieth not a contradiction. *For he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.* God only then excepted, whose original dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether 15
they be things in heaven or things on earth. In heaven he is
Heb. i. 6. far above all principalities and powers, and *all the angels of God*
Ps. ii. 8. *worship him;* on earth all nations *are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession.* Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all; and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this universality of Christ's regal authority it will be further necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly *our Lord*. It is true, he made us, and not we ourselves, we are the work of his hands; but the lowest of his creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and clotheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original

right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this redemption, though a single word, we shall find a double[75] title to a most just dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

We were first servants of the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, *and his servants we are to whom we obey:* when Christ *through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, he spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them.* But contrary to the custom of triumphing conquerors, he did not sell, but buy us; because while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life: upon the cross, as his triumphant chariot, he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord by right of redemption, both as to conquest and to purchase. Rom. vi. 16. Heb. ii. 14. Col. ii. 15.

Beside, he hath not only bought us, but provideth for us;

75 For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word *redemption*, it will be necessary to take notice of the ways by which human dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. 'Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt,' saith the civilian, *Justinian, lib.* i. *tit.* 3; but in theology we say more, 'Servi et nascuntur, et fiunt.' Man is born the servant of God his Maker, man is made the servant of his Redeemer. Two ways in general they observed, by which they came to serve, who were not born slaves. 'Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese venundari passus est.' Two ways then also there were by which dominion over those servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase, and both these were always accounted just. Dionysius Halicarnasseus, an excellent historian, a curious observer of the Roman customs, and an exact judge of their actions, being a Grecian, justifieth the right which the masters in Rome claimed over their servants upon these two grounds. *Ἐτύγχανον δὴ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις αἱ τῶν θεραπόντων κτήσεις κατὰ τοὺς δικαιοτάτους γινόμεναι τρόπους· ἢ γὰρ ὠνησάμενοι παρὰ τοῦ δημοσίου τοὺς ὑπὸ δόρυ πωλουμένους ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων, ἢ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ συγχωρήσαντος ἅμα ταῖς ἄλλαις ὠφελείαις καὶ δορυαλώτους τοῖς λαβοῦσιν ἔχειν, ἢ πριάμενοι παρ' ἑτέρων κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τρόπους κυρίων γενομένων ἐκέκτηντο τοὺς δούλους. Hist. lib.* iv. [c. 24.]; where it is also farther to be observed, that the same persons were made slaves by conquest, and possessed by purchase; by conquest to the city of Rome, by purchase to the Roman citizen. The general first took and saved them, and so made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the state from which he received his commission, and in whose name and for whose interest he fought. This state exposed their interest to sale, and so whatever right had been gained by the conquering sword, was devolved on the Roman citizen for a certain sum of money paid to the state to defray the charges of that war. Thus every lord or master of a slave so taken had full power over him, and possession of him, by right of purchase, unto which he was first made liable by conquest. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right is Christ become our Lord, and we his servants.

whatever we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is *the Prince of life,* and by him we live; he is *the Lord of glory,* and we are *called by his gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord.* Wherefore he hath us under his dominion; and becomes our Lord by right of promotion.

Acts iii. 15. 1 Cor. ii. 8. 2 Thess. ii. 14.

Lastly, men were not anciently sold always by others, but sometimes by themselves; and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismal vow we bind ourselves unto his service, that *henceforth we will not serve sin; but yield ourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God:* that, *as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so* we should *yield our members servants to righteousness unto holiness.* And thus the same dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirmed by covenant; and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of obligation.

Rom. vi. 6, 13, 19.

The necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the article appeareth, first, in the discovery of our condition; for by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons* nor our actions. *Know ye not,* saith St. Paul, *that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price.* And ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the possession[76] of their master; so that their persons were as

1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

* [In the first edition, "neither our persons, nor our possessions, nor our actions."]

76 Δοῦλος κτῆμά τι ἔμψυχον· καὶ ὥσπερ ὄργανον πρὸ ὀργάνων, πᾶς ὁ ὑπηρέτης. *Aristot. Polit. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. §. 2. Τό τε γὰρ σῶμά ἐστιν ὄργανον σύμφυτον, καὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ὁ δοῦλος, ὥσπερ μόριον καὶ ὄργανον ἀφαιρετόν· τὸ δ' ὄργανον ὥσπερ δοῦλος ἄψυχος. *Id. Eth. Eudem. lib.* vii. *cap.* 9. §. 3. And again more expressly, Τίς μὲν οὖν ἡ φύσις τοῦ δούλου, καὶ τίς ἡ δύναμις, ἐκ τούτων δῆλον· ὁ γὰρ μὴ αὑτοῦ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἄλλου, ἄνθρωπος δὲ, οὗτος φύσει δοῦλός ἐστιν· ἄλλου δ' ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἂν κτῆμα ᾖ, ἄνθρωπος ὤν. *Id. Polit. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. §. 6. So that the definition of a servant according to Aristotle is, He who, being a man, is notwithstanding the possession of a man. And although all relatives be predicated of each other in obliquo, as 'Pater est filii pater, et filius patris filius, dominus est servi dominus, et servus domini servus;' yet he observes a difference in this, that a servant is not only 'servus domini,' but simply 'domini,' but the master is not simply 'servi,' but 'dominus servi.' Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τοῦ δούλου δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνου δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μόνον δεσπότου δοῦλός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλως ἐκείνου. *Ibid.* §. 5. The servant then is so wholly in the possession and for the use of his master, that he is nothing else but a living tool or instrument; insomuch, says he, that if all tools were

properly his as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to ourselves, but to him; for in this the difference of service and freedom doth properly consist[77]: we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are[78]. Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but* John vi. 38. *the will of him that sent me.* First therefore we must conclude with the Apostle, reflecting upon Christ's dominion and our obligation, that *none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to* Rom. xiv. *himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether* 7, 8. *we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.*

Secondly, the same is necessary both to enforce and invite us to obedience; to enforce us, as he is *the Lord*, to invite us, as *Christ the Lord*. If we acknowledge ourselves to be his servants, we must *bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of* 2 Cor. x. 5. *Christ*. He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such as by their service acknowledge that dominion which he purchased. He, *though he were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things* Heb. v. 8, 9. *which he suffered; and being made perfect, he is become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.* Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of him whom we are thus obliged to serve should allure and invite us. When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. *Go thou near,* Deut. v. 27. said they to him, *and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it and do it.* If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the Law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and cheerful a promise of exact obedience unto the Law so given; how should we be invited to

like those of Dædalus, or the Tripods of Vulcan, which the poets feigned to move of themselves, artificers would need no under workmen, nor masters servants.

77 So Aristotle, *Eth. lib.* iv. [c. viii. §. 29.] *πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν—δουλικόν·* and in the first of his Rhetorics [c. ix. §. 27.] on the contrary, *Ἐλευθέρου τὸ μὴ πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν.*

78 *Τὸ ζῆν ὡς βούλεταί τις—τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἔργον·—εἴπερ τοῦ δούλου ὄντος τὸ ζῆν μὴ ὡς βούλεται. Aristot. Polit. lib.* vi. *cap.* 2. [§. 3.] 'Quid est libertas? potestas vivendi ut velis.' *Cic. Parad.* [lib. v. c. i.]

the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of Man? who are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the Patriarchs did cheerfully live 156
in the land of Goshen, subject to the power and command of Egypt, because that power was in the hand of Joseph their exalted brother; shall not we with all readiness of mind submit ourselves to the Divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? shall all the angels worship him, and all the archangels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to join with them?

Thirdly, the belief of Christ's dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute monarchs learn, that the people which they rule are not their own, but the subjects of a greater Prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this St. Paul
Col. iv. 1. doth ground his admonition to masters, *Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.* God gave a power to the Israelites to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves; and gives this reason
Lev. xxv. 42. of the interdiction, *For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.* What tenderness then should be used towards those, who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price! From hence those which are subject learn to obey the powers which are of human ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their governors, with servants to their masters: and
Col. iii. 22, 23, 24. St. Paul hath given them this charge, *Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.* Neither do we learn from hence only whom, but also how, to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are always ready to obey, but *in the Lord.*

Lastly, this title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds, and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for: *for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* Rom. x. 12. Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him until all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh, which war in our members; but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that Spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergo for his sake: but if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him: and blessed be that dominion which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of lords, and King of kings.

After this explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and express himself how he would be understood when he maketh this profession of his faith, I believe in Christ *our Lord*. For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much; I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, is the true Jehovah, who hath that Being which is originally and eternally of itself*, and of which all other beings do essentially depend: that by the right of emana-
157 tion of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universal dominion over all things, as God: that as the Son of Man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly economical, for the completing our redemption, and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father; partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so

[* This must be taken so as not to contradict what is said at p. 238, that "the "Divine essence, which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the "Virgin Mary, *he had not of himself*, but by communication from God the "Father:" and that "Jesus Christ cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine "nature originally *of himself*." In the passage now before us, the antecedent to *who* is not *Jesus Christ*, but *Jehovah*. Jesus Christ is not self-originated, but he is one with the self-originated Jehovah.]

eternal, as belonging to that kingdom which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service: for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and of purchase; and making us the sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a farther right of promotion, which, considering the covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation. And thus I believe in Christ *our Lord.*

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

THESE words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the conception of Jesus from his nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin: whereas the ancient Creeds made no such distinction; but without any particular express mention of the conception, had it only in this manner, *who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary;* or *of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*[79]; understanding by the

79 'Deum Judæi sic prædicant solum, ut negent filium ejus; negent simul cum eo unum esse qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Novatian.* 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 9. p. ccvi.] 'Natus de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. August. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap.* 34, 37, et 38. [vol. vi. pp. 209–211.] as also the Council of Francford *in Sacrosyllabo.* 'Natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb.* [vol. vi. p. 155 C.] 'Nonne de Spiritu Sancto et Virgine Maria Dei filius unicus natus est? *S. August. de Prædest. Sanct. cap.* 15. [§. 30. vol. x. p. 810 A.] Et paulo post, 'Quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. Leo, Epist.* x. *cap.* 2. [Ep. xxiv. vol. i. p. 479.] *Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Etherius Ucam. Author Symb. ad Catechum.* So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius *de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum:* 'Natum de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, in symbolo acceptum, et corde ad justitiam credit, et ore ad salutem sancta confitetur ecclesia.' [p. 505.] 'Item prædicandum est quomodo Filius Dei incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria semper Virgine.' *Capitul. Caroli* 82. and Alcuinus, *de Trin. lib.* iii. *cap.* 1. 'Dicitur in symbolo catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu Sancto et ex Maria Virgine sit natus.' In the ancient MS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. So Paulus Samosatenus in his fifth proposition; Ἰησοῦς ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας

word *born*, not only the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the Article. For they which speak only of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to express the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so far as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born; the second, He by whose energy or operation he was conceived; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

For the first, the relative in the front of this carries us clearly back unto the former Article, and tells us that he which was
158 thus conceived and born was Jesus Christ, the only Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated that this only Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it followeth that this Article at the first beginning, or by virtue of its connexion, can import no less than this most certain, but miraculous truth, that he which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulness of time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary*[80]. Again, being by the conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the human nature of our Saviour; therefore the same relative, considered with the words which follow it, can speak no less than the incarnation of that person. And thus even in the entry of the Article we meet with the

τῆς παρθένου. These words, omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the Council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian heresy, as was observed by Diogenes Bishop of Cyzicum in the Council of Chalcedon; *Οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι πατέρες οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα, τὸ ἐσαρκώθη, ὃ εἶπον οἱ ἅγιοι ἐν Νικαίᾳ πατέρες, ἐσαφήνισαν εἰπόντες, ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.* Mansi vi. p. 632 D.] In the several expositions among the sermons *de Tempore*, falsely attributed to St. Augustin, 'Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Virgine Maria.' So Eusebius Gallicanus, *Homil. de Symbolo.* [p. 553 F.] And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, *Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.*

80 'Huic, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc a Spiritu Sancto templum fabricatum intra secreta uteri virginalis intellige.' *Ruffin.* [In Symb. §. 9. p. ccvi.]

incarnation of the Son of God, that great mystery wrapt up in that short sentence of St. John, *the Word was made flesh.*

Indeed the pronoun hath relation not only unto this but to the following Articles, which have their necessary connexion with and foundation in this third; for he who was *conceived* and *born*, and so made man, did in that human nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the Word, and that Word was God, being whosoever is God cannot cease to be so; it must necessarily follow, that he was made man by joining the human nature with the Divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, because the Divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the human is conjoined, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or conceived and born. For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone; so certainly the same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the human nature was conjoined with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son; yet was that union made only in the person of the Son. Which doctrine is to be observed against the heresy of the Patripassians [81], which was both very ancient

81 The heresy of the Patripassians seems only to have relation to the suffering of our Saviour, because the word signifies no more than the passion of the Father. But it is founded in an error concerning the incarnation, it being out of question that he which was made man did suffer. Epiphanius observes, Noetus was the first which taught this heresy, who lived 130 years before him, more or less; and when he was questioned for it, he denied it; *διὰ τὸ μηδένα πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐξεμέσαι ταυτηνὶ τὴν πικρίαν. Hæres.* lvii. §. 1. [vol. i. p. 480 A.] But certainly this heresy was ancienter than Noetus; for the Patripassiani are named by St. Cyprian*, *Epist.* 73. [p. 130.] and Tertullian his master chargeth it upon Praxeas: 'Duo negotia Diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, Prophetiam expulit, et Hæresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit.' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 1. [p. 501 A.] And expressing the absurdity of that opinion; 'Itaque post tempus Pater natus et Pater passus, ipse Deus Dominus omnipotens Jesus Christus prædicatur.' [Ibid.] *cap.* 2. And *de Præscr. adv. Hæret.*† 'Post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam Hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit, hunc crucifixum passumque contendit et mortuum; præterea seipsum sibi sedere ad dextram suam, cum profana et sacrilega temeritate proponit.' *cap.* 53. [p. 223 D.] After Praxeas Noetus taught the same; Ἐτόλμησε λέγειν τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι, says Epiphanius: [Hær. lvii. §. 1. vol. i. p. 479 D.] and being questioned for it, he answered, Τί γὰρ κακὸν πεποίηκα; ἕνα Θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ἐπίσταμαι, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον πλὴν αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα, πεπονθότα, ἀποθανόντα. He thought the Father and the Son to be the same person, and therefore if the Son, the Father to be incarnate. Υἱοπάτορα τὸν Χριστὸν ἐδίδαξε, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. *S. Epiph. Anaceph.* [vol. ii. p. 145 C.] After the Noetiani followed the Sabelliani. So Philastrius [c. 54.];

* [It is however most probable that Noetus preceded Cyprian, since a treatise was written against him by Hippolytus.]

† [The last eight chapters of this work were probably not written by Tertullian.]

and far diffused, making the Father to be incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was always
159 thought to be a sufficient confutation of that fond opinion[82],

'Sabellius discipulus ejus, similitudinem sui doctoris itidem secutus est, unde et *Sabelliani* postea sunt appellati, qui et *Patripassiani*, et *Praxeani* a Praxea, et *Hermogeniani* ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa, qui et ita sententes abjecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica.' [Galland. vii. p. 488 E.] So St. Augustin, '*Sabelliani* dicti sunt quidam hæretici, qui vocantur et *Patripassiani*, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum fuisse.' *Tract.* 36. *in Joh.* [§. 8. vol. iii. part 2. p. 548 A.] This I confess is denied by Epiphanius, who acknowledged Sabellius to have followed Noetus in many things, but not in the incarnation or passion of the Father. Σαβελλιανοὶ οἱ τὰ ὅμοια ἀνοήτως (l. ἀνοήτοις, id est, Νοητιανοῖς, vel ἀνοήτῳ, id est, Νοητῷ, as St. Augustin, *Novato*) δοξάζοντες παρὰ τοῦτο μόνον· λέγουσι γὰρ μὴ πεπονθέναι τὸν πατέρα. [*Synops.* p. 398.] [vol. ii. p. 146 A.] This St. Augustin wonders very much at in Epiphanius: '*Sabelliani*, inquit, *similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum;* Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani crebrius nuncupentur?' *S. August. de Hæres.* 41. [vol. viii. p. 12 C.] Indeed the Latin Fathers generally call the Sabellians Patripassians; and not only so, but Theodoret doth so describe them as professing one person, ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατέρα νομοθετῆσαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς υἱὸν ἐνανθρωπῆσαι. [Hær. Fab.] *lib.* ii. *cap.* 9. [vol. iv. p. 223 D.] After the Sabelliani succeeded in the same heresy the Priscillianistæ, as appeareth by Pope Leo, who shews they taught but one Person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: 'Quod blasphemiæ genus de Sabellii opinione sumpserunt, cujus discipuli etiam Patripassiani merito nuncupantur: quia si ipse est Filius qui et Pater, crux Filii Patris est passio, et quicquid in forma servi Filius Patri obediendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit.' *Epist.* xciii. *cap.* 1. [al. Ep. xv. p. 450.] Thus the Patripassian heresy, beginning from Praxeas and Hermogenes, was continued by Noetus, Sabellius, and Priscillianus, and mingled with all their several heresies, the sum and substance of which is thus well set down by Victorinus; 'Patripassiani Deum solum esse dicunt quem nos Patrem dicimus; ipsum solum exsistentem et effectorem omnium, et venisse non solum in mundum, sed et in carnem, et alia omnia quæ nos Filium fecisse dicimus*.' [adv. Arium, lib. i. p. 202 C.]

82 It appeareth plainly that Tertullian confuted Praxeas, by reducing him to these words of the Creed. For when he had first declared, 'Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus (which was the objection of Praxeas) sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil,' then he subjoineth, 'Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos.' And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it followeth, 'Hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse, &c.' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 2. [p. 501 B.] This is yet farther evident out of Epiphanius, who tells us the eastern doctors confuted Noetus in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed. "Ενα Θεὸν δοξάζομεν καὶ αὐτοί, (just as Tertullian; 'Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus,') ἀλλ' ὡς οἴδαμεν δικαίως δοξάζειν· καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν ἔχομεν, ἀλλ' ὡς οἴδαμεν ἕνα Χριστὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ, πάθοντα καθὼς ἔπαθεν,

* [The fullest history of these doctrines is given by Wormius in his *Historia Sabelliana:* and it may be observed, that the opponents of Praxeas may have charged him with the Patripassian heresy, as a necessary consequence of his doctrines, though he may not himself have avowed it.]

in that the incarnation is not subjoined to the first, but to the second Article; we do not say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived,* but *in his only Son, our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

First then, we believe that he which was made flesh was the Word, that he which took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other person but the only-begotten Son. And when we say that person was *conceived* and *born,* we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature which is in all other men who by the ordi-
1 Tim. ii. 5. nary way of generation are conceived and born. For the *Medi-*
1 Cor. xv. 21. *ator between God and man* is *the Man Christ Jesus:* that since *by man came death, by man also* should *come the resurrection of the dead.* As sure then as the first Adam and we who are redeemed are men, so certainly is the second Adam and our Mediator man. He is therefore frequently called the Son of Man, and in
Gen. iii. 15. that nature he was always promised: first to Eve, as her seed,
Gen. xxii. 18. and consequently her Son: then to Abraham, *In thy seed shall*
Gal. iii. 16. *all the nations of the earth be blessed;* and that *seed is Christ,* and
[Ps. cxxxii. 11.] so he is the Son of Abraham: next to David, as his *Son to sit*
Rom. i. 3. *upon his throne;* and so he is *made of the seed of David, according*
Matt. i. 1. *to the flesh, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,* and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And as he was their Son, so are we his brethren, as descending
Heb. ii. 16, 17. from the same father Adam; *and therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.* For he *laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham;* and so became not an angel, but a man.

ἀποθανόντα καθὼς ἀπέθανεν, ἀναστάντα, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὄντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. *Hæres.* lvii. §. 1. [vol. i. p. 480 C.] And when the argument of Tertullian against Praxeas, and the Greeks against Noetus, drawn from the Creed, did not sufficiently convince the Patripassians, the Church of Aquileia, to exclude them wholly, added these two words to the first Article, *invisibilem,* and *impassibilem. Invisibilem,* to shew he was not incarnate; *impassibilem,* to shew he was not crucified. So Ruffinus in the conclusion of his exposition upon these words, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem,* addeth, 'His additur *invisibili* et *impassibili:*' and then gives the reason, 'Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a nostris *Patripassiani* appellatur, id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur talis impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, et invisibilem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne et ex carne natum, et ex nativitate carnis Filium visibilem et passibilem factum.' [p. cciii.]

As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so doth Christ: he assumed a body, at his conception, of the blessed Virgin. *Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his nativity[83]; and the actions and passions of his life shew the nature of his flesh. Heb. ii. 14.

He was first born with a *body* which was *prepared for him,* of the same appearance with those of other infants; he grew up by degrees, and was so far from being sustained without accustomed nutrition of our bodies, that he was observed even by his enemies to *come eating and drinking,* and when he did not so, he suffered hunger and thirst. Those plowers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who *ploughed upon his back and made long furrows.* The thorns which pricked his sacred temples, the nails which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the natural tenderness and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty days together, lest his walking on the waters and traversing the seas, lest his sudden standing in the midst of his
160 Disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh, he confirmed first his own Disciples, *Feel and see,* that a *spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me to have.* As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confess him to have come in the verity of our human nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it always necessary to acknowledge him: for *every spirit, that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit, that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God.* This Spirit appeared early in opposition to the apostolical doctrine; and Christ, who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man, as God. Simon Magus, the arch-heretic, first began, and many after followed him[84]. Luke xxiv. 39. 1 John iv. 2, 3.

83 'Marcion, ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut, ut nativitatem negaret, negavit et carnem: scilicet, ne invicem sibi testimonium redderent et responderent nativitas et caro; quia nec nativitas sine carne, nec caro sine nativitate.' *Tertul. de Carne Christi, cap.* 1. [p. 307 B.]

84 Simon Magus first made himself to be Christ; and what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto Christ. 'Dixerat se in monte Sina Legem Mosi in Patris persona dedisse Judæis, tempore Tiberii in Filii persona putative apparuisse.' *S. August.* [Hæres. i.]* So St. Cyril represents him,

* [These words are rejected by the Benedictine editors. See vol. viii. p. 5. note 6.]

And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. For *Jesus increased in wisdom and stature;* one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, increase: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his years, must have a subject proper for it, which was no other than a human soul. This was the seat of his finite understanding and directed will, distinct from the will of his Father, and consequently of his Divine nature; as appeareth by that known submission, *Not my will, but thine be done.* This was the subject of those affections and passions which so manifestly appeared in him: nor spake he any other than a proper language, when before his suffering he said, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.* This was it which on the cross, before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the souls of the departed are: for *when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.* And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body, so the life of Christ as Man did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that soul with the body. So that he which was *perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting* *. Which is to be observed and asserted against the ancient heretics[85], who taught that Christ assumed human flesh,

Luke ii. 52.

Luke xxii. 42.

Matt. xxvi. 38.

Luke xxiii. 46.

* [This does not merely mean "*consisting* of a reasonable soul and human flesh," but *subsisting* is to be taken by itself for *having a real and substantial existence, ὑφεστώς.*]

Οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ, ἀλλὰ δοκήσει, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν φανέντα. *Catech.* 6. [§. 15. p. 96 A.] From this δόκησις of his invention arose the heresy of the Δοκηταί. For Saturnilus or Saturninus followed his disciple Menander with his 'putative tantum hominem,' as Irenæus, and 'in phantasmate tantum venisse,' as Tertullian speaks. After him Valentinus and his followers, Epiphanes, Isidorus, and Secundus; then the Marcosians, Heracleonitæ and Ophitæ, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, and generally the Manichees. Those were the Δοκηταί or Φαντασιασταί, all conspiring in this, that Christ was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to endure. This early heresy appeareth by the opposition which St. Ignatius made unto it in his Epistles.

85 Of this kind two several sects were most remarkable, the Arians and the Apollinarians. Arius taught that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the Word was joined. Ἄρειος δὲ σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, τουτέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γεγονέναι. *S. Athanas. de Adv. Christi.* [contra Apollin. ii. §. 3. vol. i. p. 942 C.] So Felicianus the Arian, in *Vigilius de Unitate Trin. cap.* 17. [p. 348.] 'Ita enim a majoribus nostris semper est traditum,

but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

161 Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of Man[86] was assumed by the Word, by him who was *conceived and born* of a woman, and so made a Man. And being the Divine nature which he had before, could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the Divine nature which he had, was in this incarnation made man by that human nature which he then assumed; and so really and truly was both God and man[87]. And thus this third Article, from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no less than the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

quod Christi corpus ad vicem animæ communis ipsius Filii Dei habitus animarit; nec accensione animalis spiritus indigens fuerit, cui inhabitans fons vitæ potuit conferre quod vixit.' Eunomius followed him in this particular: Ἄρειος δὲ καὶ Εὐνόμιος σῶμα μὲν αὐτὸν ἔφασαν εἰληφέναι, θεότητα δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνηργηκέναι τὴν χρείαν. *Theod. cont. Hæret. lib.* v. *cap.* 11. [vol. iv. p. 278 D.] Apollinaris distinguished between the soul and the mind, the ψυχή and the νοῦς, and acknowledged that the Word assumed the body and the soul or ψυχή of man, but not the mind or spirit, or the νοῦς, but the Word itself was in the place of that. 'Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi ab Ecclesia Catholica dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In quæstione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, non fuisse in anima Christi, sed pro hac ipsum verbum in ea fuisse, dixerunt.' This was then the clear difference betwixt the Arian and Apollinarian heresy: 'Apollinaristæ quidem carnis et animæ naturam sine mente assumpsisse Deum credunt, Ariani vero carnis tantummodo.' *Facun. lib.* ix. [c. 3. p. 762 C.] So that two things are to be observed in the Apollinarians, their philosophy and their divinity: their philosophy, in making man consist of three distinct parts, the body, the soul, and the mind; their divinity, in making the human nature of Christ to consist but of two, the body and the soul, and the third to be supplied by the Word. Which is excellently expressed by Nemesius *de Nat. Hom.* in respect of his philosophy: Τινὲς μὲν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Πλωτῖνος, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν νοῦν δογματίσαντες, ἐκ τρίων τὸν ἄνθρωπον συνεστάναι βούλονται, σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ νοῦ. Οἷς ἠκολούθησε καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ὁ τῆς Λαοδικείας γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος· τοῦτον γὰρ πηξάμενος τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς οἰκείας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προσῳκοδόμησε κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον δόγμα. [c. 1. p. 466 B.] And by Theodoret in respect of his divinity: Σαρκωθῆναι δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἔφησε λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνειληφότα οὐ τὴν λογικὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄλογον, ἣν φυσικὴν, ἤγουν ζωτικὴν, τινὲς ὀνομάζουσι. τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἄλλό τι παρὰ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λέγων, οὐκ ἔφησεν ἀνειλῆφθαι, ἀλλ' ἀρκέσαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τοῦ νοῦ τὴν χρείαν. [Hæret. Fab. iv. 8. vol. iv. p. 240 D.]

86 'Quid a Patre Christus acceperat, nisi quod et induerat? hominem sine dubio, carnis animæque texturam.' *Tertul. de Resur. Carnis, cap.* 34. [p. 346 A.] 'Hoc toto credente jam mundo, puto quod et Dæmones confiteantur Filium Dei natum de Maria Virgine, et carnem naturæ humanæ atque animam suscepisse.' *S. Hieron. Apol.* 2. *adv. Ruffinum.* [vol. ii. §. 4. p. 493 B.]

87 Νῦν δὴ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς αὖτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, Θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος. *S. Clem. Alex. ad Gentes.* [vol. i. c. 1. p. 7.]

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these ways can consist with the person of our Saviour, or the office of our Mediator. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so far from acknowledging him to be both God and man, that thereby we should profess him to be neither God nor man, but a person of a nature as different from both, as all mixed bodies are distinct from each element which concurs unto their composition. Besides, we know there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the Divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem[88] of that infinite and independent Being, as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

Again, as the confusion, so the conversion of natures is impossible. For, first, we cannot with the least show of probability conceive the Divine nature of Christ to be transubstantiated into the human nature; as those whom they call *Flandrian Anabaptists* in the Low Countries at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnancy even in the supposition: for the nature of man must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of man. The immaterial, indivisible, and immortal Godhead cannot be divided into a spiritual and incorruptible soul, and a carnal and corruptible body; of which two humanity consisteth. There is no other Deity of the Father than of the Son; and therefore if this was converted into that humanity, then was the Father also that man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died. We

Teste Episcopio, Instit. Theol. l. iv. c. 8.

88 'Absit ita credere, ut conflatili quodam genere duas naturas in unam arbitremur redactas esse substantiam; hujusmodi enim commixtio partis utriusque corruptio est. Deus enim qui capax est, non capabilis, penetrans, non penetrabilis, implens, non implebilis, qui ubique simul totus, et ubique diffusus est per infusionem potentiæ suæ, misericorditer naturæ mixtus est humanæ, non humana natura naturæ est mixta Divinæ.' *Leporius Libel. Emend.* [c. iv. p. 397 D.]

must not therefore so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, *The Word was made flesh* [89], as to destroy the propriety both of the *Word* and of the *flesh*.

162 Secondly, we must not, on the contrary, invent a conversion of the human nature into the Divine, as the Eutychians of old did fancy. For sure the incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the humanity of Christ could not at the first be made by being the Divinity of the Word. Nor is the incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the manhood were not in the first act of incarnation converted into the Divine nature, as we see it could not be; then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was afterward [90] so

89 In that proposition, Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, there hath been strange force used by men of contrary judgments, and for contrary ends, as to the word ἐγένετο. The Socinians endeavouring to prove it can have no other sense than simply *fuit*, the Word *was* flesh: the Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the highest sense of *factum est*, the Word *was made* flesh. It is confessed that the verb γίνεσθαι in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriac rendered it ומלתא בסרא הוא *Et verbum caro fuit;* the ancient Latin, *Et verbum caro factum est.* It cannot be denied but in the Scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old vulgar translation in some places renders it, as the Syriac doth here, Matt. x. 16. Γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, *Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes;* and 25. Ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, *Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus.* From whence it is evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word γίνεσθαι, but in the circumstance of the matter in which it was used. Howsoever, neither of these interpretations prove either of these opinions. For if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh, and it hath been already proved and presupposed by St. John in his precedent discourse, that the Word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that he which was before the Word, and was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again, if he which was made flesh was the Word, and after he was made such was still the Word, as certainly he was, and is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh can no way evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity.

90 This was the proper opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own confession in the Council of Chalcedon. Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. *Act.* I. [Mansi vi. p. 744 B.] Two distinct natures he confessed at first; but when the union was once made, he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made, he expressed not, nor could his followers agree; some attributing it to the conception, some to the resurrection, others to the ascension. Howsoever, when they were united, his opinion clearly was, that the human nature was so absorpt into the divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there

transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of Eutyches, who thought the union to be made so in the natures, that the humanity was absorbed and wholly turned into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the human nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this heresy, make use of the sacramental union between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and thereby shewed, that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of transubstantiation[91].

was but one, that is the divine, nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by St. Leo, who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his opinion, *Serm.* 8. *de Nativ.* [vol. i. p. 171.] 'Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus assertor unitionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum, ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus alterius exsistente substantia.' And the Eranistes in the Dialogue of Theodoret arguing for that opinion, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining, the other did not so, answered plainly, Ἐγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεμενηκέναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. [Dial. ii. vol. iv. p. 77 A.]

[91] There can be no time in which we may observe the doctrine of the ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an heresy evidently known, and make use generally of the same arguments against it. Now what the heresy of Eutyches was is certainly known, and the nature of the sacrament was generally made use of as an argument to confute it. Gelasius Bishop of Rome hath written an excellent book against Eutyches, *De duabus naturis in Christo*, in which he propoundeth their opinion thus: 'Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, divinam;' and, 'Sola exsistente deitate, humanitas illic esse jam destitit.' That then which he disputes against is the transubstantiation of the human nature into the divine. The argument which he makes use of against it is drawn from the eucharist: 'Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ: et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet, in divinam, transeant, Sancto Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanente* tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrant.' [p. 671 B.] In which words it is plain he affirms the union of the human nature of Christ to be the principal mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the sacrament of the eucharist: he concludes from thence, that as in the representation the substance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the human nature of Christ in the greater mystery doth still remain. In

* [*for. legendum est*, permanentia, Routh, Script. Eccles. Opusc. ii. 139.]

163 Being then he which is *conceived* was the *only Son of God*, and that *only Son* begotten of the substance of the Father, and so always subsisted in the Divine nature; being by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assumed an human nature; being these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that only Son was he which is conceived and born: it followeth, that the union which was not made in the nature, was made in the person of the Word; that is, it was not so made, that out of both natures one only should result, but only so, that to one person no other should be added.

Nor is this union only a scholastic speculation, but a certain

the margin of this place in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* there is printed *Caute*, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the Fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerately. In the same manner we find a disputation between an Heretic and a Catholic in the second dialogue of Theodoret, [vol. iv. p. 85 B.] where Eranistes, as an heretic, asks Orthodoxus by what names he calls the bread and wine after consecration; who answers, the body and blood of Christ: from whence Eranistes argues, Ὥσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος ἄλλα μὲν εἰσὶ πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δέ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται· οὕτω τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μετεβλήθη τὴν θείαν. *As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ are one thing before consecration, and after that change their name, and become another; so the body of Christ after his ascension is changed into the Divine substance.* To this Orthodoxus answers, Ἑάλως αἷς ὕφηνες ἄρκυσιν, *You are taken in your own nets.* Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *The bread and wine even after consecration leave not their own nature, but remain in their former substance, shape, and form.* In the same manner, καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὲν πρότερον εἶδος ἔχει καὶ σχῆμα καὶ περιγραφὴν, καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς εἰπεῖν, τὴν τοῦ σώματος οὐσίαν. *The body of Christ hath the same form, figure, and shape, and indeed the same bodily substance.* And when Eranistes still objects, that the bread is called the body, and not bread, Orthodoxus answers that he is mistaken; Οὐ γὰρ σῶμα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄρτος ζωῆς ὀνομάζεται, οὕτως αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος προσηγόρευσε, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ σῶμα θεῖον ὀνομάζομεν σῶμα. *For it is not only called the body, but also bread of life, and the body itself we call the Divine body.* Who sees not then that Theodoret believed no more that the bread is converted into the body, than that the body is converted into the Divinity of Christ? Who perceives not that he thought the bread to be as substantially and really bread after the consecration, as the body of Christ is really a body after his ascension? The same argument is used by St. Chrysostom upon the same occasion against the Apollinarians in his Epistle *ad Cæsarium*, not yet published in Greek, and by Ephraimus *in Photii Bibliotheca* against the Eutychians. As therefore all the μεταστοιχείωσις of the sacramental elements maketh them not cease to be of the same nature which before they were; so the human nature of Christ, joined to the Divine, loseth not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a substance in itself distinct; and so Christ doth subsist not only *ex*, but *in duabus naturis*, as the Council of Chalcedon determined against Eutyches.

and necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediator, but two Mediators; without which we cannot join the second Article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred Scriptures, or understand the history of our Saviour. For certainly he which was before Abraham, was in the days of Herod born of a woman; he which preached in the days of Noah, began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being at that time about thirty years of age; he was demonstrated the Son of God with power, who was the seed of David according to the flesh; he who died on the cross, raised
1 Pet. iii. 18. him from the dead who died so, being *put to death through the*
Rom. ix. 5. *flesh, and quickened by the Spirit;* he was *of the fathers according to the flesh,* who was *God over all blessed for ever.* Being these and the like actions and affections cannot come from the same nature, and yet must be attributed to the same person; as we must acknowledge a diversity of natures united, so must we confess the identity of the person in whom they are conjoined, against the ancient heresy of the Nestorians[92], condemned in the council of Ephesus.

92 This heresy doth most formally contradict these words of the Creed, because it immediately denies this truth, that the eternal Son of God was conceived and born. And in vain did Nestorius seek not only to avoid it in the Nicene Creed, but to make use of the words of the Creed even against the unity of the Person of Christ. St. Cyril had well objected the series, order, and consequence of that confession: Ἔφη ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη Συνόδος, αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς, τὸν δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν ὁ Πατὴρ, κατελθεῖν, σαρκωθῆναί τε καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, παθεῖν, ἀναστῆναι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς οὐρανούς. [Epist. v. vol. v. pt. ii. p. 25 D. The words after ἀναστῆναι are not in Aubert's edition.] The strength of this objection lies in this, that Christ, the only-begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds, was incarnate. The answer of Nestorius was in this manner: Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· σκόπησον ὅπως Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς, καὶ μονογενὴς, καὶ υἱὸς, πρότερον θέντες, τὰ κοινὰ τῆς θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς θεμελίους, ὀνόματα, τότε τὴν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, καὶ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ἐποικοδομοῦσι παράδοσιν. [Ibid. p. 26 B.] And the strength, or rather the weakness, thereof is this: that first the Council placed the names of Jesus, Christ, and the only-begotten Son, names common to the divinity and humanity of Christ; and then upon them built the doctrine of his Incarnation. Whereas it is evident that, supposing the *only-begotten* a term common to the humanity and divinity, yet the Council clearly expounds it of the eternal generation, adding immediately, *begotten of his Father before all worlds;* neither is there any word between that exposition and the *Incarnation,* but such as speak wholly of Christ as God. Therefore that only-begotten Son, who was *begotten of his Father before all worlds,* descended from heaven, and was incarnate. Thus St. Cyril in his second Epistle to Nestorius, and Nestorius in his second to him. Which mistake of his seems yet more strange to

164 *By the Holy Ghost.*

HAVING thus despatched the consideration of the first Person concerned in this Article, and the actions contained in it so far as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same; and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration; first, of the conception; secondly, of the Person; thirdly, of the operation. But for the Person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here only mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article, where it is propounded directly. And for the conception itself, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the act cannot be predicated. For though Christ *was conceived by the Holy Ghost*, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, *Thou shalt conceive.* There remaineth therefore nothing Luke i. 31.
proper and peculiar to this second part, but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be *conceived by* him.

Now when we say the conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the Angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a Son, she said, *How shall this be, seeing I know* Luke i. 34.
not a man? By which words she excludeth first all men, and

me, when I consider in the same Epistle of Nestorius that fundamental truth asserted, which of itself sufficiently, nay, fully confutes his heresy: for he acknowledgeth the name of *Christ* to be *ἀπαθοῦς καὶ παθητῆς οὐσίας ἐν μοναδικῷ προσώπῳ προσηγορίαν σημαντικήν*, [Ibid. p. 26 E.] and consequently Christ himself to be a single person in a double nature, passible and impassible: which once granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time, for by those several nativities he had those several natures; that he which was impassible as God, might and did suffer as man, because the same person was of an impassible and a passible nature; impassible as God, passible as man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, was incarnate and made man; and as evident out of the Apostles' Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same only-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

then herself: all men, by that assertion, *I know not a man;* herself, by the question, *How shall this be, seeing* it is so? First, our Melchizedeck had no father on earth; in general, not
Matt. i. 18. any man; in particular, not Joseph. It is true, *his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph:* but it is as true, *before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.* We read
Luke ii. 27. in St. Luke, that *the parents brought the child Jesus into the Temple:* but these parents were not the father and the mother,
Luke ii. 33. but as it followeth, *Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.* It is true, Philip calleth him
John i. 45. *Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph;* and which is more, his
Luke ii. 48. mother said unto him, *Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing*:* but this must be only the reputed father of Christ,
Luke iii. 23. he being only, *as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli.* Whence they must needs appear without all excuse, who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the genealogy belongs to him; whereas in that very place where the genealogy begins, Joseph is called the supposed father. How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David, it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not only in St. Luke, where Joseph begins,
Matt. i. 16. but also in St. Matthew, where he ends the genealogy. *Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is* 165
called Christ[93]. Howsoever then the genealogies are described, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not only that Christ descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

Secondly, as the blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion, so did she exclude herself by the manner of the question, shewing that of herself she could not cause any such con-

[93] Indeed in our translation, *whom* may relate to both, as well as one, and to Joseph as well as Mary; but in the original it evidently belongs to Mary; Τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς.

* [Jesus might be thought to have tacitly alluded to this incorrect expression of his mother, when he said to her, "Wist ye not that I ought to be in my "*Father's* house?" for so the words ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου ought to be translated.]

ception. Although she may be thought the *root of Jesse*, yet could she not germinate of herself; though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the divine benediction which was given to both together: For *God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth.* Though Christ was promised as the *Seed of the woman*, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible, and the Angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, *For with God nothing shall be impossible.* God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation*.

Gen. i. 28.

Luke i. 37.

But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scripture are very general: first, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to Mary; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee:* secondly, as they suppose the conception already past; *When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost;* and give satisfaction unto Joseph, *Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.* Now being the expressions in the Scriptures are so general, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin, much less shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction, made in this Article, *conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin;* because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him, according to the prophecy, *Thou shalt conceive and bear a Son:* and therefore, notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains, how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of prepositions[94] be sufficient rightly to distinguish these opera-

Luke i. 35.

Matt. i. 18.

Matt. i. 20.

94 As, 'conceptus de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine.' St. Augustin indeed hath delivered a distinction between *de* and *ex*, after this manner,

* [This last sentence is in the Latin translation, 'Excludi tamen nequit ab hac operatione persona illa, quæ est ille Deus.']

tions. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the action of the Holy Ghost, but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly* the mother of Christ (as certainly she was, and we shall

speaking to those words of the Apostle, '*Quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso, sunt omnia. Ex ipso* non hoc significat quod *de ipso*. Quod enim de ipso est, potest dici ex ipso ; non autem omne quod ex ipso est, recte dicitur de ipso. Ex ipso enim cœlum et terra, quia ipse fecit ea ; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantia sua. Sicut aliquis homo si gignat filium, et faciat domum, ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus ; sed filius de ipso, domus de terra et ligno.' *De Nat. Boni adv. Manich. cap.* 26, 27. [vol. viii. p. 508 C.] This distinction having no foundation in the Latin tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of prepositions; for as we read of Mary, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, so also of the Holy Ghost, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, and τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου. It is therefore said as well ἐκ πνεύματος, as ἐκ Μαρίας. Again, the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one, *de qua natus est Jesus*, and for the other, *in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto*. Correspondently in the Greek Creeds, συλληφθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος, γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας, or as in the Nicene, ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ Μαρίας. And the Latin not only *de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine*, but sometimes *de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine*, and *de Maria Virgine*. Chrysologus and St. Augustin often *de Trinitate*. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of St. Augustin's distinction, and then applied it to Christ's conception, first taking the preposition *de* to signify no less than a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost, because the eternal Son, who was so begotten, was of the same substance with the Holy Ghost. Thus Thomas Aquinas has delivered the subtilty, *Sum. p.* iii. *q.* 32. *a.* 2. 'In Spiritu Sancto duplex habitudo consideratur respectu Christi. Nam ad ipsum filium Dei, qui dicitur esse conceptus, habet habitudinem consubstantialitatis ; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem causæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpositio *de* utramque habitudinem designat, sicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem esse de suo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere possumus Christum esse conceptum de Spiritu Sancto hoc modo, quod efficientia Spiritus Sancti referatur ad corpus assumptum, consubstantialitas vero ad personam assumentem.' But this distinction of consubstantiality and effective causality can make nothing for the propriety of the phrase ; for the preposition *de* signifieth the material cause as well as the efficient, it must do so in respect of that which is the effect, if it require that the thing which is made be made of the substance of that de quo est : then must Christ, according unto that which is made, be made of the substance of the Holy Ghost ; or, to speak in the words of the Scripture, 'Quod in ea natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est.' Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin must be acknowledged of the substance of the Holy Ghost, or else the preposition *de* must not be taken in St. Augustin's sense. Howsoever, being there is but one preposition ἐκ, common to both in the original Greek ; being the Vulgar translation useth *de* indifferently for either ; being where they have distinguished *de* and *ex*, they have attributed *ex*, which doth not signify consubstantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confess he did assume the substance of his body, and *de*, which signifieth (as they say) consubstantiality, to the Holy Ghost, of whose substance he received nothing ; it followeth, that the difference in the prepositions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Christ's conception.

* [In the first edition it is "truly and properly."]

hereafter prove), then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the
166 fruit of their womb; and consequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother. When the Scripture speaketh of regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing the *sons of God* as *begotten not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God:* and in the incarnation of our Saviour, we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring; but as the *bloods* in the language of the Hebrews did signify that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ, that he was made of the substance of his mother. John i. 12, 13.

But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said, Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, if the ancients speak as if he generated[95] the Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of paternity.

Again, as the Holy Ghost did not frame the human nature of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he formed any part of his flesh of any other substance than of the Virgin. For certainly he was of the fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the Son of David and of Abraham. The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way before Christ's conception by which he could be the only-begotten Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ: one part received from the Virgin, and so consequently from David and from Abraham, from whom that Virgin did descend; another framed by the

95 As Chrysologus, *Serm.* 57. [p. 703 C.] 'Ubi Spiritus generat, Virgo parturit, totum divinum geritur, nihil humanum.' Et *Serm.* 62. 'Stupenti mundo solus aperit quid est, quod Spiritus generat, Virgo concipit, Virgo parit.' [p. 707 F.]

* [Such expressions occurred oftener in the first edition, but were altered into "conceived by the Virgin Mary."]

Spirit, and conjoined with it[96]; by the one part of which humanity he was the Son of Man, as by the other part he was the Son of God.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion 167
of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone
Job xiv. 4. God hath declared himself to be well pleased. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?* saith Job; a clean and undefiled Redeemer out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is Holiness, whose operation is to sanctify, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things as born of a woman, sin only excepted, as *conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

[96] 'Deus ipsemet ad sanguinem Mariæ addidit aliam materiam, ex quibus deinde Christus conceptus et natus est.' *Smalcius, de vero et naturali Dei Filio, cap.* 2. [p. 17.] 'Verum manet generationem et hanc dici posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest, si ad sanguinem Mariæ addita sit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Mariæ juncta natus sit Christus.' *Ibid. cap.* 3. What this was thus added to the substance of the Virgin, he elsewhere explains: 'Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam substantiam creatam vel immisisse aut ibi creasse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, verus homo generatus fuit.' This he doth not only without any authority affirm, but ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For so it follows: 'Alias enim homo ille Dei filius a conceptione et nativitate proprie non fuisset.' And again, 'Necessitas magna fuit ut Christus, ab initio vitæ suæ esset Dei Filius, qualis futurus non fuisset, nisi Dei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset, quod ad constituendum Christi corpus una cum Mariæ sanguine concurrit.' Thus while they deny the eternal generation of the Son, they establish a temporal in such manner as is not consonant with that word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Christ partly descending from the Father, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, sin only excepted, they have invented a body, partly like ours, partly not, and so in no part totally like. Indeed some of the ancients did speak so as to make the Holy Ghost the semen Dei: as Tertullian; 'Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei semine, i. e. Spiritu, ut esset et hominis filius, caro ei sola erat ex hominis carne sumenda sine viri semine. Vacabat enim viri semen apud habentem Dei semen.' *De Carne Christi, cap.* 18. [c. 17. p. 311 B.] And St. Hilary calls it 'sementivam ineuntis Spiritus efficaciam.' *De Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 26. [p. 801 C.] But in this they only understood the operation of the Spirit, loco seminis. And whosoever spake of any proper *semen*, they abhorred; as appears by the 191st sermon *De Tempore*; [al. 236. §. 4. vol. v. App. p. 388 G.] 'Nec, ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur, Spiritum Sanctum dicimus pro semine fuisse, sed potentia et virtute Creatoris operatum.' I know not whether be the greatest folly; to make the Holy Ghost the Father, as these men have done, by creating part of his body by way of seminal conjunction; or to make the same Spirit Mother of Christ, as the Nazareans did. 'In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lectitant Nazaræi, Salvator inducitur loquens, *Modo me arripuit mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.*' There is only this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the Holy Ghost a partial, the other a total, mother.

This original and total sanctification of the human nature was first necessary, to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who, out of his infinite love, humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind: that as the first Adam was the fountain of our impurity [97], so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. *God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh;* which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinful flesh. The Father *made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;* which we could not have been made in him, but that he *did no sin,* and *knew no sin.* For whosoever is sinful wanteth a Redeemer; and he could have redeemed none, who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed *with the precious blood of Christ:* therefore precious, because *of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot.* Our atonement can be made by no other High-Priest than by him who *is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.* We cannot *know that he was manifested to take away our sins,* except we also know that *in him is no sin* [98]. Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our human nature in the Person of our Saviour; it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

Rom. viii. 3. 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 22. 1 Pet. i. 19. Heb. vii. 26. 1 John iii. 5.

Again, it hath been observed [99], that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the human nature in its first original, without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to

97 'Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco et habitu tantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter, totum genus humanum damnaretur, non solvitur ac diluitur, nisi per unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei non opus esset renasci.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 48. [§. 14. vol. vi. p. 214 E.]

98 'In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret.' *S. August.* [In Ep. Joan. Tract. iv. §. 8. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 854 E.]

99 By St. Augustin; 'Ex hoc, quod de Spiritu Sancto est secundum hominem nativitas Christi, quid aliud quam ipsa gratia demonstratur?' *Enchir. cap.* 37. [p. 211 B.]

the Word; so that the grace was co-existent, and in a manner connatural with it[1]. The mystery of the incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodness of
Luke i. 78. God. *Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from*
Tit. iii. 4. *on high hath visited us:* in this, *the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.* And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love and mercy of God to man 168
alone, offered unto him in the incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men only; yet because they speak so generally with reference to God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all merit universally. Especially considering the impossibility of merit in Christ's humanity[2], in respect of his conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy; by this we learn from what fountain this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the womb; but as he was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived
John i. 13 not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are *born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* The same overshadowing power which formed his human nature, reformeth ours; and the same Spirit[3] assureth us a remission of our sins, which caused in him an exemption from all sin. He which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born within us upon our regeneration[4].

1 'Modus iste quo natus est Christus de Spiritu Sancto non sicut filius, et de Maria Virgine sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo, nullis præcedentibus meritis, in ipso exordio naturæ suæ quo esse cœpit, Verbo Deo copularetur in tantam personæ unitatem, ut idem ipse esset filius Dei qui filius hominis, et filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac sic in naturæ humanæ susceptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia illi homini naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per Spiritum Sanctum fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut dicatur etiam Dei donum.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 40. [p. 212 D.]

2 'Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat humana natura, ad personam tamen unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; et tantam gratiam, ut nulla sit major, nulla prorsus æqualis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis ulla merita præcesserunt, sed ab illa susceptione merita ejus cuncta cœperunt.' *S. August. Tract.* 82. *in Joan.* [vol. iii. part ii. p. 707 A.]

3 'Ea gratia fit ab initio fidei suæ homo quicunque Christianus, qua gratia homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipso Spiritu et hic renatus, de quo est ille natus. Eodem Spiritu fit in nobis remissio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum est ut nullum haberet ille peccatum.' *S. Aug. de Præd. Sanct. cap.* 15. [§. 31. vol. x. p. 810 C.]

4 'Nolite desperare; quod semel natum est ex Maria, quotidie et in nobis

All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the Article, whereby every person may understand what he is to profess, and express what is the object of his faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.* For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the human nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoining it with the Divine in the unity of his Person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnal copulation, not by the common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the Law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

169 *Born of the Virgin Mary.*

THE third person considerable in this third Article is represented under a threefold description, of her name, condition, and action. The first telleth us who it was, it was Mary; the second informeth us what she was, a Virgin; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God, which was *born of the Virgin Mary.*

The Evangelist, relating the annunciation, taketh particular notice of this name; for shewing how an angel was sent unto *a* *Luke i. 27.*
Virgin espoused to a man, he first observeth that his *name was Joseph;* and then that *the Virgin's name was Mary:* not for any peculiar excellency in the name itself, or any particular application to the Virgin arising from the origination of it, as some have conceived[5]; but only to denote that singular person, which

nascitur.' *S. Hieron. Comm. in Psal.* lxxxiv. [vol. vii. App. p. 227.]

5 For some have thought the dignity of the Virgin to be denoted in her name. As Gregorius Nyssenus (or rather his interpolator,) *Homil. in Natal. Christi:* [vol. iii. p. 346 D.] Ἐπειδὰν ἐτέχθη τὸ παιδίον, ὠνόμασε μὲν αὐτὴν Μαρίαν, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπωνυμίας τὸ θεόδοτον διασημανθείη τῆς χάριτος· mistaking, as I conceive, the origination of *Mary* for that of *Anna,* her mother,

was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto Joseph,
Matt. xiii. 55. as appeareth by the question of his admiring countrymen, *Is not this the Carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?* Otherwise the name was common even at that time to many; to the
John xi. 1. Mat. xxvii. 56. sister of Lazarus, to the mother of James and Joses, to the wife of Cleophas*, to the mother of John, whose surname was Mark,
John xix. 25. to her which was of Magdala in Galilee, to her who bestowed

חנה. Thus he thought *Grace*, others *Dominion*, to be contained in her name. Ἡ Μαρία ἑρμηνεύεται κυρία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλπίς. Κύριον γὰρ ἔτεκε τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου Χριστόν. *Auctor Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariæ, sub nomine Epiphanii.* [Epiph. vol. ii. p. 292 B.] Τίκτει τοιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις (τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ Ἀννὰ ἑρμηνεύεται) τὴν κυρίαν· τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τῆς Μαρίας τὸ ὄνομα. *Damasc. Orthod. Fid. lib.* iv. *cap.* 14. [vol. i. p. 275 B.] 'Sciendum quod *Maria* sermone Syro Domina nuncupatur.' *S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebraicis.* So Chrysologus; 'Dignitas Virginis annunciatur ex nomine: nam *Maria* Hebræo sermone, Latine Domina nuncupatur. Vocat ergo Angelus Dominam, ut Dominatoris genitricem trepidatio deserat servitutis, quam nasci et vocari Dominam ipsa sui germinis fecit et impetravit auctoritas.' *Serm.* 142. [p. 765 D.] 'Sermone Syro *Maria*, Domina nuncupatur, et pulchre, quia Dominum genuit.' *Isidor. Hispal. Orig. lib.* vii. *cap.* 10. [p. 62 E.] The same Isidore, with others, gives another etymology: '*Maria*, illuminatrix, sive stella maris; genuit enim lumen mundi.' *Ibid.* And Bernard, *Homil.* 2. *super Missus est*, [p. 31 M.] 'Loquemur pauca et super hoc nomine, quod interpretatum *maris stella* dicitur, et matri Virgini valde convenienter aptatur. Ipsa namque aptissime sideri comparatur, quia sicut sine sui corruptione sidus suum emittit radium, sic absque sui læsione Virgo parturit filium.' So far not amiss. But when from a bad etymology he makes worse divinity, calling her the *Star of Jacob*, and attributing unto her the light of our minds, the life of our graces, and extirpation of our vices, (the work of the Spirit of Christ,) when in the midst of all our temptations, horrors of conscience, and depths of despair, he adviseth us immediately to a 'Respice Stellam, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca;' his interpretation can warrant no such devotion. This etymology also descendeth from St. Jerom, who in his interpretation of the names in Exodus, as from Philo, '*Maria*, illuminatrix mea, vel, illuminans eos, aut smyrna maris, vel stella maris.' And again, on the names in St. Matthew, '*Mariam* plerique existimant interpretari, illuminant me isti, vel illuminatrix, vel smyrna maris; sed mihi nequaquam videtur. Melius autem est ut dicamus sonare eam stellam maris, sive amarum mare.' Ἑρμηνεύεται πάλιν τὸ Μαρία σμύρνα θαλάσσης. *Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariæ.* [p. 292 B.] 'Dictæ sunt et ante Mariæ multæ: nam et Maria soror Aaron dicta fuit, sed illa Maria amaritudo maris vocabatur.' *S. Ambros. Instit. Virg. cap.* 5. [§. 34. vol. ii. p. 257 B.] Indeed that *ab amaritudine*, without the adjection of *mare*, is the etymology observed by the Jews, as appears by the author of the *Life of Moses*†, who, relating how Amram took Jochebed to wife, and of her begat a daughter, addeth ותקרא שמה מרים כי נעת ההיא החלו המצריים בני הם למרור חיי בני ישראל: *She was called Miriam, because at that time the Egyptians, who were the offspring of Cham, made the lives of the sons of Israel bitter.* And in the like manner *Seder Olam*, [c. iii. p. 19.] נקרא שמה מרים על שם מירור

* [The wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses, seem to have been the same person. Compare Matt. xxvii. 56. John xix. 25.]

† [An account of this anonymous work, called דברי הימים של משה, may be found in Wolff's Bibliotheca Heb. ii. 1278. The words quoted occur in page 2 of the Venice edition of 1544.—R. P. S.]

much labour on St. Paul: nor is there any original distinction between the name of these and of the mother of our Lord[6]. For as the name of Jesus was the same with Josuah, so this of
170 Mary was the same with Miriam[7]. The first of which name recorded was the daughter of Amram, the sister of Moses and Aaron, a Prophetess; to whom the bringing of Israel out of Egypt is attributed, as well as to her brethren. *For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,* saith the Lord, *and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron,*

Acts xii. 12. Luke viii. 2. Rom. xvi. 6.

Mic. vi. 4.

6 This is to be observed, by reason of some learned men, who make the name of the Virgin different from that of others called Mary in the Gospel, upon two grounds, in respect of the accent, and the termination; the one being Μαριάμ the other Μαρία; the first with an Hebrew termination, indeclinable, and the accent *in ultima;* the latter with a Greek termination, declinable, and the accent *in penultima.* As, Ὄνυμα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ, Luke i. 27, in the nominative: Ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριάμ, Luke ii. 5, in the dative; Μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν Μαριάμ, Matt. i. 20, in the accusative; and Μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ, Luke i. 30, in the vocative case. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never named Μαρία; as none of the rest by any of the Evangelists is ever called Μαριάμ. But notwithstanding this observation, we find the same Virgin's name declined: as, Μνηστευθείσῃ τῇ μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας, Matt. i. 18, and, Σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Acts i. 14, both which must come from the Greek termination Μαρία *in recto.* And, on the contrary, that Mary which St. Paul mentioneth hath the same Hebrew termination with the Virgin, Ἀσπάσασθε Μαριὰμ, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. Rom. xvi. 6. Beside, the Syriac translation makes no difference between the name of these and of the Virgin, as, מרים מגדליתא ומרים אמה דיעקוב Mark xv. 40. So again, מרים מגדליתא ומרים אחרתא Matt. xxviii. 1. And therefore there can be no sufficient foundation for any such distinction.

7 For whereas we first read, Exod. xv. 20, מרים הנביאה the LXX. translate it, Μαριὰμ ἡ προφῆτις, and the vulgar Latin, *Maria prophetissa.* The Hebrew first was מִרְיָם *Mirjam;* the Syriac altering the pronunciation, not the letters, מִרְיָם *Marjam,* as for יִמְגְּדוֹל מַגְדַּל. And because the Greek language admitteth no *jod* consonant, they pronounced it Μαριάμ. Though sometimes indeed even the Greeks did use the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as Lucian with the Latins makes Ἰουδαῖος of three syllables:

Ἰουδαῖος ἕτερον μῶρον ἐξᾴδει λαβών.
Tragop. v. 172.

Again, because no Greek word endeth in μ, to make it current in that language, it was necessary to alter the termination, according to their custom; as for Annibal Ἀννίβας, Asdrubal Ἀσδρούβας, Amilcar Ἀμίλκας, and Κάϊν, Καΐς. This was to be done sometimes by addition; as Νώχ Νῶχος, Ἀβέλ Ἄβελος, Λαμέχ Λάμεχος, Ἰαρέδ Ἰάρεδος, Ἐνώς Ἔνωσος, Σήθ Σῆθος, Ἀδάμ Ἄδαμος, Ἀβραάμ Ἄβραμος and Ἀβραάμης. And so for Μαριάμ, Μαριάμμη or Μαριάμνη. Josephus, Μαριάμη τοῦ παιδὸς ἀδελφήν, of Miriam the sister of Moses; whom in another place he calls ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ Μαριάμνην. Therefore he thought the name of *Mariamne* to be the same with *Miriam.* And as the Greeks were wont to add their own terminations to exotic words, so did they at other times leave out the exotic terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for אביה and חנה Ἀβία and Ἄννα, for אסא and זרח Ἀσά and Ζαρά, for תרח Θαρά, for Μαριάμ Μαρία. Wherefore from the Hebrew *Mirjam* came, by variety of pronunciation, at first the Syriac *Marjam,* and from the Syriac *Marjam,* at first, only by the variation of pronunciation, Μαριάμ, then, for the propriety of termination, Μαρία.

and Miriam. As she was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage; so was this Mary exalted to become the mother of that Saviour, who through the Red sea of his blood hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type: and even with the confession of the lowliness of an handmaid she seems to bear that exaltation in her name[8].

Beside this name of the blessed Virgin, little hath been discovered to us. Christ, who commended the faith of the centurion, the love of Mary Magdalene, the excellencies of John the Baptist, hath left not the least encomium of his mother. The Evangelists, who have so punctually described the city, family, and genealogy of Joseph, make no express mention of her rela-
[Lukei. 36, 5.] tions, only of her *cousin Elizabeth,* who was of the tribe of Levi, *of the daughters of Aaron.* Although it be of absolute necessity to believe that he which was born of her descended from the tribe of Judah, and the family of David; yet hath not the Scripture clearly expressed so much of her, nor have we any more than an obscure tradition[9] of her parents Joacim and Anna.

8 For though that interpretation *Domina* may seem to come conveniently enough from מרא, yet that being rather from the Chaldees, cannot so well agree with *Miriam;* nor is the מ so properly added at the end, as to the beginning of an Hebrew word, where it is usually in words of simple signification Heemantical. Again, though מר ים may signify *Smyrna maris,* or *Illuminatrix,* which St. Jerom rejected; and *Stella* (or rather *Stilla,* which is properly מר) *maris,* or *amarum mare,* which he rather embraced; yet these compositions are not so proper, or probable at all, especially in a name dissyllable. Though the Jews themselves deduce it from מרר, to signify the *bitterness* of the Egyptian bondage, as we read in *Midrash* ויושע,* beside the two authors before quoted, נקראת מרים שמררו המצרים את חייהם yet still the addition of the final *mem* is not proper; or if that should stand for הם, there were no good account to be given of the *jod.* Whereas if we deduce it from the *radix* רום, with the addition of the Heemantic *mem,* the notation is evident, and the signification clear, as of one exalted above others.

9 I call this a *tradition,* because not in the written word; and *obscure,* because the first mention we find of it was in the fourth century. Epiphanius first informs us, who, speaking of Joseph, says he knew thus much: Γυναῖκα μὲν ἤδει αὐτὴν τῇ πλάσει, καὶ θήλειαν τῇ φύσει, καὶ ἐκ μητρὸς Ἄννης, καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωακείμ. *Hæres.* lxxviii. §. 17. [vol. i. p. 1049 D.] Again, Εἰ ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖσθαι οὐ θέλει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἄννης γεγεννημένην, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωακείμ τῇ Ἄννᾳ δεδωρημένην; *Hæres.* lxxix. §. 5. [p. 1062 C.] where he makes

* [The Midrash ויושע is an exposition of the Canticle of Moses, said to be of the eleventh century, and takes its name from the first word of Exod. xiv. 30. The Bodleian copy consists of four leaves, and the words referred to are in the first column, נקראת מרים על שם וימרה את חייהם בעבודה קשה. A similar but more important passage may be found in the Midrash Rabbah on Exod. xvii. 8.—R.P.S.]

Wherefore the title added to that name maketh the distinction: for as divers characters are given to several persons by
171 which they are distinguished from all others of the same common nomination, as Jacob is called Israel, and Abraham the Friend of God, or Father of the faithful: so is this Mary sufficiently characterized by that inseparable companion of her name, *the Virgin*[10]. For the full explication whereof more cannot be required, than that we shew first that the Messias was to be born of a Virgin, according to the prediction of the Prophets; secondly, that this Mary, of whom Christ was born, was really a Virgin when she bare him, according to the relations of the Evangelists; thirdly, that being at once the mother of the Son of God, and yet a Virgin, she continued for ever in the same virginity, according to the tradition of the Fathers, and the constant doctrine of the Church.

The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denied the first; resolved rather not to understand Moses and the Prophets, than to acknowledge the interpretation of the Apostles. It will therefore be necessary from those Oracles which were committed unto them, to shew the promised Messias was to be born after a

mention of the history of Mary, and the traditions concerning her nativity. Ἡ τῆς Μαρίας ἱστορία, καὶ παραδόσεις ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἐρρέθη τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῆς Ἰωακεὶμ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτι ἡ γυνή σου συνειληφυῖα, &c. *Damasc. Orthod. Fid. lib.* iv. *cap.* 14. et *Orig. cont. Cels. de Panthera.** What this history of Mary was, or of what authority those traditions were, we cannot learn out of Epiphanius. What the interpolator of Gregory Nyssen's Homily produceth, he confesseth taken from apocryphal writings. And divers of the like relations descended from the prime and greatest heretics. The Gnostics had a book among them, which was called Γέννα Μαρίας. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* xxvi. §. 12. [vol. i. p. 94.] Amongst the Manichees Seleucus wrote the history of the Virgin. And the *Protevangelium Jacobi* deceived many in relations of this nature; among which, many being certainly false, it is not now easy (if at all possible) to distinguish what part of them or particular is true. 'Quod de generatione Mariæ Faustus posuit, quod patrem habuerit ex tribu Levi sacerdotem quendam nomine Joachim, quia canonicum non est, non me constringit,' saith St. Augustin, *cont. Faust.* lib. xxiii. cap. 9. [vol. viii. p. 427 B.]

[10] Τίς ποτε, ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ γενεᾷ τετόλμηκε καλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα Μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας, καὶ ἐρωτώμενος οὐκ εὐθὺς ἐπήνεγκε τὸ παρθένον; Ἐξ αὐτῶν γὰρ τῶν ἐπιθέτων ὀνομάτων καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ὑποφαίνει τὰ τεκμήρια. Ἀξιώματα μὲν γὰρ ὀνομασιῶν εἰλήφασιν οἱ δίκαιοι ἑκάστῳ πρεπόντως, καὶ ὡς ἥρμοζε. Καὶ τῷ μὲν Ἀβραὰμ προσετέθη τὸ φίλος Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ διαλυθήσεται· τῷ δὲ Ἰακὼβ, τὸ Ἰσραὴλ καλεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἀλλοιωθήσεται, καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, τὸ βοανεργὲς, τουτέστιν, υἱοὶ βροντῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἀποκαταλειφθήσεται· καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ Μαρίᾳ, τὸ παρθένος, καὶ οὐ τραπήσεται. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* lxxviii. §. 6. [vol. i. p. 1038 A.]

* [Celsus seems to have mentioned a report, that the Virgin Mary was with child by a soldier called Panthera. i. 32. p. 350 A.]

miraculous manner, to be the son of a woman, not of a man. Gen. iii. 15. The first promise of him seems to speak no less; *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head:* for as the name of *seed* is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is Christ; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

Jer. xxxi. 22. According to this first evangelical promise followed that prediction of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, A woman shall compass a man.* That new creation of a man is therefore *new,* and therefore a *creation,* because wrought in a woman only, without a man, compassing a man; which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, literal, and clear[11]; and whatsoever the Jews have invented to elude it, is frivolous and forced. For while they force the phrase of *compassing a man,* in the latter part of the prediction, to any thing else than a

11 For it is not to be denied that the proper signification of סבב is *circumdare,* or *cingere.* R. Judah has observed but one interpretation of this verb, כולם ענין אחד; and Kimchi testifieth that all words which come from the root סבב signify *incompassing,* or *circuition.* Therefore those words, נקבה תסובב גבר must literally import no less than that *a woman shall encompass,* or *enclose a man,* which, with the addition of a *new creation,* may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messias: as appeareth in *Bereshit Rabba, Parash.* 89.* where shewing that God doth heal with that with which he woundeth, he saith, as he punished Israel in a virgin, so would he also heal them with a Virgin, according to the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, and R. Josuah the son of Levi, זה מלך המשיח שנ' היום ילדתיך *This is Messiah the King, of whom it is written,* (Psal. ii. 7.) *This day have I begotten thee.* And again in *Midrash Tillim* (fol. 4. c. 3.) upon the 2d Psalm, R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, speaking of the sufferings of the Messiah, saith, That when his hour is come, God shall say, עלי לבראתו בריה חדשה וכן הוא אומר אני היום ילדתיך *I must create him with a new creation. And so* (by virtue of that new creation) *he saith, This day have I begotten thee.* From whence it appeareth that this sense is of itself literally clear, and that the ancient Rabbins did understand it of the Messias; whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we profess, that Jesus was born of a Virgin, and therefore is the Christ.

* [Quoted, to the end of the extract from Midrash Tillim, from Martini Pug. Fid. p. 284. The Bereshit Rabba referred to is not the well-known work of that name, but a somewhat apocryphal manuscript, of which Martinus has made great use in his treatise. Its reputed author is R. Moses Haddarshan, the teacher of the famous Rashi; but the passages quoted are entirely contrary to the views of the Jews in the eleventh century, when he lived. A short summary of the arguments for and against the possible existence of this work may be seen in Wolff's Bibl. Heb. i. p. 818.—R. P. S.]

conception, they do not only wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easy to perform.

But if this prophecy of Jeremy seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of Isaiah, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Emmanuel.* The ancient Jews, immediately upon the promulgation of the Gospel[12], understanding well how near this place did press them, gave three several answers to this text: first, denying that it spake of a Virgin[13] at all; secondly, asserting that it could not belong to Jesus[14]; thirdly, affirming that it was fully completed in the person of Hezekiah[15]. Whereas the original word was translated *a Virgin*, by such interpreters as were Jews themselves[16], some hundred years before our Saviour's birth. And did not the notation of the word, and frequent use thereof in the Scrip-

Isa. vii. 14.

172

12 How soon these objections were made use of by the Jews, will appear by Justin Martyr, the first writer which made any considerable explication and defence of the Christian religion; who, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, shews us what were the objections of the Rabbins: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν τολμᾶτε λέγειν, μηδὲ εἰρῆσθαι ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ τοῦ Ἡσαΐου, Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, ἀλλ', Ἰδοὺ, ἡ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν· §. 43. [p. 139 E.] And Tertullian, whose works are full of the divinity of Justin; 'Si quando ad dejiciendos aliquos ab hac divina prædicatione, vel convertere singulos simplices quosque gestitis, mentiri audetis, quasi non Virginem, sed juvenculam, concepturam et parituram Scriptura contineat.' *Adv. Jud. cap.* 9. [p. 192 C.] *et adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 13. [p. 404 B.]

13 And as they soon began, so did they go on with this objection: 'Hodie, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Judæi, Esaia docente [de Maria et virginitate ejus,] *Ecce virgo in utero concipiet, et pariet filium,* in Hebræo *juvenculam* scriptum esse, non *virginem,* id est, *halma,* non *bethula.*' [S. Hieron. adv. Helvidium, vol. ii. p. 209 A.]

14 'Dicunt Judæi, Provocemus istam prædicationem Esaiæ, et faciamus comparationem, an Christo, qui jam venit, competat illi primo nomen quod Esaias prædicavit, et insignia ejus quæ de eo nunciavit. Equidem Esaias prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, dehinc virtutem sumpturum Damasci et spolia Samariæ adversus regem Assyriorum. Porro, inquiunt, iste qui venit, neque sub ejusmodi nomine est editus, neque re bellica functus.' *Tertul. adv. Jud. cap.* 9. [p. 192 A.]

15 So Justin testifieth of the Jews, speaking to Trypho, and in him to them: Ἐξηγεῖσθε τὴν προφητείαν ὡς εἰς Ἐζεκίαν τὸν γενόμενον ὑμῶν βασιλέα. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 43. [p. 139 E.] And Trypho replies again to Justin, Ἴδωμεν ὡς ἐκεῖνον εἰς Χριστὸν τὸν ὑμέτερον ἀποδεικνύεις εἰρῆσθαι· ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἰς Ἐζεκίαν αὐτὸν λέγομεν πεπροφητεῦσθαι. *Ibid.* §. 77. [p. 174 A.]

16 The LXX. Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται. It is true, the rest of the interpreters, concurring with the objection of the Jews, translated it, Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις, i. e. *adolescentula,* or *juvencula.* But as their antiquity, so their authority is far short of the LXX, especially in this case. I shall not need to shew how the origination of עלמה from עלם proves no less. We know the affinity of the Punic tongue with the Hebrew; and by the testimony of St. Jerom, 'Lingua Punica, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, proprie virgo *alma* appellatur.' [vol. iv. p. 109 B.]

tures persuade it, the wonder of the *sign* given by the *Lord himself* would evince as much. But as for that conceit, that all should be fulfilled in Hezekiah, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false, that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this sign was given and this promise made (*a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son*) at some time in the reign of Ahaz. This *Ahaz reigned* but *sixteen years in Jerusalem;* and Hezekiah his son, who succeeded him, *was twenty and five years old when he began to reign,* and therefore born several years before Ahaz was king, and consequently not now to be conceived when this sign was given. Thus while the ancient Jews name him only to fulfil the prophecy, in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly shew, that, for any knowledge which they had, it was not fulfilled till our Saviour came: and therefore they cannot with any reason deny but that it belonged unto the Messias, as divers of the ancient Rabbins thought and confessed; and is yet more evident by their monstrous error, who therefore expected no Messias in Israel[17], because they thought whatsoever was spoken of him to have been completed in Hezekiah. Which is abundantly enough for our present purpose, being only to prove that the Messias promised by God, and expected by the people of God, before and under the Law, was to be conceived and born of a Virgin.

2 Kings xvi. 2: xviii. 2.

Secondly, as we are taught by the predictions of the Prophets, that a Virgin was to be the mother of the promised Messias; so are we assured by the infallible relations of the Evangelists, that this Mary the mother of Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, was a Virgin when she bare him, when she *brought forth her first-born Son.* That she was a Virgin when and after she was espoused unto Joseph, appeareth by the narration of St. Luke:

Luke i. 26, 27. *For the Angel Gabriel was sent from God to a Virgin espoused*

17 It is the known saying of Hillel, recorded in *Sanhedrin c. Chelek,* (fol. 98vo.) אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיה *There is no Messias to the Israelites, because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.* Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to mollify these words of Hillel by their several expositions, but in vain. And R. Joseph understood him better, who thought he took away all expectation of a Messias, and therefore fairly prayed for him, 'Condonet Dominus hoc R. Hillel.' Howsoever it appears that from two principles, whereof one was false, he gathered that false conclusion. For first, he thought those words in Isaiah were spoken of the Messias: which proposition was true. Secondly, he conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in him, which proposition was false. From hence he inferred, that the Israelites were not to expect a Messias after Hezekiah: which conclusion was also false.

to a man whose name was Joseph. After the salutation of that Angel, that she still was so, appeareth by her question, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* That she continued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost, is evident from the relation of St. Matthew: for when she was *espoused unto Joseph,* Matt. i. 18.
before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. That she was a Virgin not only while she was with
173 child, but even when she had brought forth, is also evident out of his application of the Prophecy; *Behold, a Virgin shall* Matt. i. 23.
be with child, and shall bring forth a Son. For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a Virgin should *bring forth,* as *conceive a Son*[18]. Neither was her act of parturition more contradictory to virginity, than that former of conception.

Thirdly, we believe the mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after his nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient as to the mystery of the incarnation[19], that when our Saviour was conceived and born, his mother was a Virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first-fruit of her womb; though there be no farther mention in the Creed, than that he was *born of the Virgin Mary:* yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and

18 'Hæc est Virgo quæ in utero concepit, Virgoque peperit filium. Sic enim scriptum est, *Ecce Virgo in utero concipiet, et pariet filium.* Non enim concepturam tantummodo Virginem, sed et parituram Virginem dixit.' *S. Ambros. Epist.* 7. *ad Siricium.* [al. Ep. 42. §. 5. vol. ii. p. 967 C.] So he argued from the prophecy, and St. Augustin from the Creed: 'Quo si vel nascente corrumperetur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur; eumque falso, quod absit, *natum de Virgine Maria* tota confiteretur Ecclesia, quæ, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie parit membra ejus, et virgo est.' *Enchir. cap.* 34. [vol. vi. p. 210 A.] As also St. Ambrose in the same Epistle: 'Quæ potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare; quum semper conceptus præcedat, partus sequatur. Sed si doctrinis non creditur sacerdotum, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur monitis angelorum dicentium, credatur symbolo Apostolorum, quod Ecclesia Romana intemeratum semper custodit et servat.' [vol. ii. p. 967 A.] And St. Basil upon occasion of the same prophecy: 'Η αὐτὴ γυνὴ καὶ παρθένος καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμῷ τῆς παρθενίας μένουσα, καὶ τὴν τῆς τεκνογονίας εὐλογίαν κληρονομοῦσα. *Homil.* 25. [vol. ii. p. 599 D.] 'Virgo peperit, quia Virgo concepit.' *Vigil. de Unitate Trin. cap.* 10. [p. 340.]

19 Μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου. *S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.]

piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the *ever Virgin Mary*[20]. As if the gate of the sanctuary in the Prophet Ezekiel were to be understood of her: *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it: because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.*

Ezek. xliv. 2.

Many indeed have taken the boldness to deny this truth[21],

[20] For so the Greek church always called her ἀειπάρθενος*, and from them the Latins *Semper Virgo.*

[21] First we read in the time of Origen, that some did maintain the Virginity of Mary no longer than to Christ's nativity. 'In tantam nescio quis prorupit insaniam, ut assereret negatam fuisse Mariam a Salvatore, eo quod post nativitatem illius juncta fuerit Joseph.' *Homil. 7. in Lucam*†. Tertullian himself was produced as an assertor of the same opinion‡; nor does St. Jerom deny it, though I think he might have done it§. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, delivered the same, says Epiphanius, and Eunomius with his, τὸν Ἰωσὴφ μετὰ τὴν ἄφραστον κυοφορίαν συνάπτειν οὐ πεφρίκασι τῇ παρθένῳ, as Photius out of Philostorgius‖. Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philostorgius, for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never express their opinions with an οὐ πεφρίκασι. And as he always commended Eunomius, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is, a man of his own sect. As that epigram,

Εὐνομιανοῦ
Ἱστορίην ἐτέλεσσα Θεοῦ χαρίτεσσι σοφῇσι·

which I therefore mention, because Gotofred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the verse, ἐτέλεσσ' ἀθέου, and a worse interpretation in the inscription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholic, and the name of the sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake, saying Eunomianus was the name of a man, twice spoken of in Suidas, once in Εὐνομιανός, and again in ἔλουσε. It is true indeed Suidas says expressly, Εὐνομιανός, ὄνομα κύριον, and immediately adds these words, τὸν δὲ Εὐνομιανὸν ἔλουσε Βελισάριος τὸ θεῖον λουτρόν, as if Belisarius had baptized one whose name was Eunomianus. But the words are taken out of Procopius *in Hist. Arcana, pag. 2.* from whence it appears that he who was baptized was by name Theodosius, and by sect an Eunomian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that epigram on the history of Philostorgius, he was certainly by sect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the inscription, written without question by some Catholic, who thought no

* [The earliest writer in whom I have observed this term, is Athanasius, *Orat.* ii. *cont. Arian.* 70. p. 538 B. *In Psalm.* lxxxiv. 11. p. 1151. *In Luc.* p. 1271. She was called so at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Evagr. ii. p. 324.) and in the Confession of Faith published by the emperor Justin II. in the sixth century. (Ibid. p. 429, 430.)]

† [That Origen himself maintained the perpetual virginity of Mary, is plain from his saying, εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς υἱὸς Μαρίας, κατὰ τοὺς ὑγιῶς περὶ αὐτῆς δοξάζοντας, ἡ Ἰησοῦς, κ.τ.λ. *in Joann.* i. 6. vol. iv. p. 6 D.]

‡ [The passages adduced are, *de Carne Christi*, c. 7. p. 312. *de Monogam.* c. 8. p. 529. but neither of them is conclusive.]

§ [The meaning is, that Jerom might have denied that such an opinion was held by Tertullian.]

‖ [The passage may be seen in Reading's edition of the ecclesiastical historians, vol. iii. p. 510.]

because not recorded in the sacred Writ: and not only so, but to assert the contrary as delivered in the Scriptures; but with
174 no success. For though, as they object, St. Matthew testifieth that Joseph *knew not* Mary *until she had brought forth her first-born Son,* from whence they would infer, that afterwards he knew her; yet the manner of the Scripture-language produceth no such inference[22]. When God said to Jacob, *I will not leave* Matt. i. 25. Gen. xxviii. 15.

man could commend the history of Philostorgius but one of his own opinion. These contradictors of the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a general name, *Antidicomarianitæ.* And from him St. Augustin, 'Antidicomarianitæ appellati sunt hæretici, qui Mariæ Virginitati usque adeo contradicunt, ut affirment eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam.' *de Hæres.* 56. [vol. viii. p. 19 C.] condemned under that name by the sixth General Council, *Act.* 2. The same were called by the Latins, *Helvidiani,* from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian,) whose name is most made use of, because refuted by St. Jerom. He was followed by Jovinian, a monk of Milan, as St. Jerom testifieth; though St. Augustin delivereth his opinion otherwise, 'Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam.' [Hær. lxxxii. vol. viii. p. 24 B.] And Bonosus, a Bishop in Macedonia, referred by the Council of Capua to the judgment of Anysius Bishop of Thessalonica, was condemned for the same, as appeareth by the 79th Epistle of St. Ambrose, written to Theophilus and Anysius: 'Sane non possumus negare de Mariæ filiis jure reprehensum, meritoque vestram sanctitatem abhorruisse, quod ex eodem utero virginali, ex quo secundum carnem Christus natus est, alius partus effusus sit.' [vol. ii. p. 1009 A.] This is the catalogue of those by the ancients accounted heretics for denying the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

[22] For in the word ἕως there is no such force. Τὸ ἕως οὐ πάντως ἀντιδιαιρεῖται τῷ μέλλοντι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέχρι μὲν τοῦδε τίθησι, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀναίνεται. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat.* 2. *de Filio.* [Orat. xxx. §. 4. vol. i. p. 542 A.] Τὸ ἕως πολλαχοῦ χρόνου μέν τινα δοκεῖ περιορισμὸν ὑποφαίνειν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀληθείαν τὸ ἀόριστον δείκνυσιν. *S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.] Ἔθος τῇ γραφῇ τὴν ῥῆσιν ταύτην μὴ ἐπὶ διωρισμένον τιθέναι χρόνον. *S. Chrysost.* [In Matt. Hom. v. §. 3. vol. vii. p. 77 A.] Τὸ ἕως πολλάκις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ διηνεκῶς ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ εὑρίσκομεν κείμενον. *Isidor. Pelus. lib.* i. *Epist.* 18. [p. 6 B.] Τὸ ἕως πολλαχοῦ οὐκ ἐπὶ χρόνου λέγει, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος. *Adrian. Isag. in S. S.* Τὸ ἕως ἐνίοτε μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ἐφεξῆς χρόνου παραλαμβανόμενον, ἐνίοτε δ' οὖν ἐπὶ δηλώσει μεγάλων μὲν ἔργων καὶ θεοπρεπῶν· καθάπερ καὶ νῦν, οὐ μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἑτέρου χρόνου τινός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐναντίον εἰς ὑποδήλωσιν ἀπεράντου διαστήματος. *Phot. Epist.* 30*. [p. 89.] In the same manner it is observed by the Greek grammarians of πρίν, that if any one declared that he did it not πρὶν *before* such a thing were done, it followeth not that he did it when or after that thing was done. As when Helena saw and knew Ulysses a spy in Troy, she promised upon oath that she would discover him to none till he was safe returned to the Grecian fleet:

———Καὶ ὤμοσα καρτερὸν ὅρκον,
Μὴ μὲν πρὶν Ὀδυσῆα μετὰ Τρώεσσ' ἀναφῆναι,
Πρίν γε τὸν ἐς νῆάς τε θοὰς κλισίας τ' ἀφικέσθαι. Ὀδ. δ'. 253.

And yet it is not likely, says Eustathius, that Helena did ever discover Ulysses to the Trojans after he was returned. Ἐν δὲ τῷ, Μὴ πρὶν Ὀδυσσέα Τρωσὶν

* [Theophylact (ad loc. p. 10 C.) refers to Gen. viii. 7. οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν ἕως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. See also 2 Sam. vi. 23. Matt. v. 18. xxiv. 34. xxvi. 29. 1 Tim. iv. 13. Glassius, *Philol. Sacr.* p. 457.]

thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of, it followeth not that when that was done, the God of Jacob left him. When the conclusion of Deuteronomy was written, it was said of Moses, *No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day:* but it were a weak argument to infer from thence, that the sepulchre of Moses hath been known ever since. When Samuel had delivered a severe prediction unto Saul, he *came no more to see* him *until the day of his death:* but it were a strange collection to infer, that he therefore gave him a visit after he was dead. *Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death:* and yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave. Christ promised his presence to the Apostles *until the end of the world:* who ever* made so unhappy a construction as to infer from thence, that for ever after he would be absent from them?

Deut. xxxiv. 6.

1 Sam. xv. 35.

2 Sam. vi. 23.

Mat. xxviii. 20.

Again, it is true that Christ is termed the *first-born Son of Mary*[23], from whence they infer she must needs have a second; but might as well conclude that wheresoever there is one there must be two. For in this particular the Scripture-notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it supposeth none to have gone before, but concludeth not any to follow after. *Sanctify unto me,* saith God, *all the first-born;* which was a firm and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth: whereas if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have been no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born been sanctified

Exod. xiii. 2.

ἀναφῆναι, πρὶν αὐτὸν εἰς νῆας ἱκέσθαι, εἴπερ μὴ δοκεῖ πιθανὸν ἢ εὐλόγιστον τὸ ἀναφῆναι ὅλως τὸν Ὀδυσσέα Τρωσὶν, ἐνθυμητέον τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ, μὴ πρὶν ποιῆσαι τὸ δέ τι πρὶν ἂν τόδε γένηται· ἥτις ἐν τῇ α΄ ῥαψῳδίᾳ τῆς Ἰλιάδος κεῖται. καὶ φανεῖται ἐκεῖθεν, ὡς οὐκ εἰκὸς τὴν Ἑλένην εἰπεῖν τοῖς Ἰλιεῦσι περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως οὐδὲ ὅτε εἰς νῆας καὶ κλισίας ἀφίκετο αὐτός. A negation anteceding πρὶν or ἕως, is no affirmation following them.

23 For I shall not deny that Christ was called the *first-born* in respect of his Mother, though Epiphanius thought that a sufficient answer: Οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγέννησε τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτὴν ἕως ὅτου ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν πρωτότοκον. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτῆς ἐσήμανεν, ἐξ αὐτῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννῆσθαι· ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ τοῦ πρωτοτόκου ἐπωνυμίᾳ, οὐκέτι τὸ αὐτῆς ἔθετο, ἀλλὰ πρωτότοκον μόνον. *Hæres.* lxxviii. §. 17. [p. 1049 B.] as if her Son the first-born were not her first-born Son. Οὐ τάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιγινομένους ἔχει τὴν σύγκρισιν, ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτον διανοίγων μήτραν πρωτότοκος ὀνομάζεται. *S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 B.] 'Primogenitus est non tantum post quem et alii, sed ante quem nullus.' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [§. 10. vol. ii. p. 214 E.] It is observed by Servius, to that of Virgil's Æneid. i. 5. *Trojæ qui primus ab oris,* that *primus* is *post quem nullus.*

* [In the first edition it is "who never made," &c. without the note of interrogation.]

of itself, but the second birth had sanctified the first. And well might any sacrilegious Jew have kept back the price of redemption due unto the priest, nor could it have been required of him, till a second offspring had appeared[24]; and so no redemption at all had been required for an only son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the Law, because the original Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction; בכור and in the Law itself it carrieth with it a clear interpretation,

175 *Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is mine.* The apertion of the womb determineth the first-born[25]; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation: *Those that are to be redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem;* no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption. Being then *they brought* our Saviour *to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the Law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;* it is evident he was called the *first-born* of Mary according to the notion of the Law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor proveth the mother to have any other offspring.

Exod. xiii. 2. Num. xviii. 16. Luke ii. 22, 23.

Indeed, as they thirdly object, it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord: *He went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren;* and, *While he talked unto the people, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.* But although his mother and his brethren be named together, yet they are never called the sons of his mother; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his mother brought forth any other children. It is possible Joseph might have children before Mary was espoused to him; and then as he was reputed and called our Saviour's father, so might they well be accounted and called his brethren, as the ancient Fathers[26], especially of

John ii. 12. Matt. xii. 46.

24 Thus St. Jerom makes his plea: 'Quid me in unius mensis stringis articulo? quid primogenitum vocas, quem an fratres sequantur ignoro? Exspecta donec nascatur secundus: nihil debeo sacerdoti, nisi et ille fuerit procreatus, per quem is qui ante natus est incipiat esse primogenitus.' *Adv. Helvid.* [vol. ii. p. 215 C.]

25 'Definivit sermo Dei quid sit *Primogenitum; Omne*, inquit, *quod aperit vulvam.*' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [p. 215 A.]

26 Origen first delivereth it on St. Matthew, [tom. x. 17. vol. iii. p. 463 A.] and Eusebius sheweth his opinion, speaking of St. James the brother of our Lord. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1. [p. 44.] Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφὸν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ

the Greek Church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that Joseph had any offspring, because the language of the Jews includeth in the name of *brethren* not only the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such
Gen. xiii. 8. persons allied unto the blessed Virgin. *We be brethren,* said Abraham unto Lot; when Abraham was the son of Terah, Lot of Haran, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew,
Gen. xii. 5. and, as elsewhere properly styled, *the son of his brother.*
Lev. x. 4. *Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary;* whereas those brethren were Nadab and Abihu, the
Gen. xxix. 12. sons, not of Uzziel, but of Aaron. *Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's brother, and that he was Rebecca's son:* whereas Rebecca was the sister of Rachel's father. It is sufficient therefore that the Evangelists, according to the constant language of the Jews, call the kindred of the blessed Virgin the brethren and sisters of her only Son; which indeed is something the later[27], but the most generally approved, answer.

Ἰωσὴφ ὠνόμαστο παῖς· τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ. So we read, as it is set forth by R. Stephanus; but in my book collated with an ancient MS. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ νομιζομένου οἱονεὶ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ· which is much more plain; for ὠνόμαστο παῖς is nothing so pertinent in this particular as υἱὸς ἦν. So St. Epiphanius, Ἦν γὰρ ὁ Ἰάκωβος οὗτος υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ γυναικὸς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, οὐκ ἀπὸ Μαρίας· *Hæres.* xxix. §. 4. [vol. i. p. 119 A.] and, speaking of the rest, he calls them τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ τῆς ὄντως αὐτοῦ ἄλλης γυναικός. *Hæres.* xlii. *Refut.* 12. [p. 326 B.] Thus St. Hilary, 'Homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum, qui si Mariæ illi fuissent, et non potius Joseph ex priore conjugio suscepti, &c.' *Com. in Matth. cap.* 1. [p. 612 D.] Thus also St. Ambrose *de Virg.* and generally all the Fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterwards, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and Nicephorus. These all seem to have followed an old tradition, which is partly still continued, in St. Epiphanius: Ἔσχε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἰωσὴφ τὴν μὲν πρώτην αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ κυΐσκει αὐτῷ αὖτη παῖδας τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἓξ, τέσσαρας μὲν ἄρρενας, θηλείας δὲ δύο. *Hæres.* lxxviii. §. 7. [p. 1039 B.] The first of these six children was James: μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ γίνεται παῖς Ἰωσῆ καλούμενος, εἶτα μετ' αὐτὸν Συμεών, ἔπειτα Ἰούδας· καὶ δύο θυγατέρες, ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη καλουμένη. §. 8. Thus had the Greeks a distinct relation of the sons and daughters of Joseph, and of the order of their generation. Whose authority I shall conclude with that of Jobius; Ἔδει πατέρα καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάσαι τὸν ἀπάτορα· οὐκ ἐκ τῶν λῃστῶν καὶ πονηρῶν τούτους ἐξελέξατο, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ διαλάμποντας· τοιοῦτος γὰρ Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ οἱ τούτου παῖδες. *Œcon. lib.* ix. *in Phot. Biblioth.* 222. [p. 202.] and that of Amphilochius Junior; Ἠπίστησαν δέ ποτε καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ υἱοὶ, καθὼς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς, καὶ τῇ πείρᾳ διδαχθέντες τὸ ἀληθὲς, γεγραφήκασιν Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰούδας παντὶ τῷ κοσμῷ, Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλους ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι. *Orat. in Deip.* [p. 56 B.]

27 The first, I conceive, who returned this answer, was St. Jerom, in a Tractate written in his youth at Rome

176 And yet this difficulty, though usually no farther considered, is not fully cleared; for they which impugned the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, urged it farther, pretending that as the Scriptures called them the *brethren of Christ*, so they also shewed them to be the sons of Mary the mother of Christ. For first, the Jews express them particularly by their names, *Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses,* Matt. xiii. *and Simon, and Judas*[28]*?* Therefore James and Joses were [55].

against Helvidius; wherein, after a long discourse of several acceptions of *brethren* in the Scriptures, he thus concludes: 'Restat igitur, ut—fratres eos intelligas appellatos, cognatione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non natura: quo modo Lot Abrahæ, quo modo Jacob Laban est appellatus frater.' [vol. ii. p. 223 A.] And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, he says it was grounded merely upon an apocryphal history; 'Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, et quandam Escham mulierculam confingentes.' *Com. in Matt. cap.* xii. 49. [vol. vii. p. 86 B.] Indeed Origen himself, followed in this particular by the Greek Church, did confess no less; who tells the authors from whom that interpretation first arose; τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ φασί τινες εἶναι, ἐκ παραδόσεως ὁρμωμένοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικὸς, συνωκηκυίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας. in Matt. [tom. x. 17. vol. iii. p. 462 E.] This Jacobus mentioned by Origen is the same with him whom Eustathius mentions in *Hexaemero* [p. 70.] Ἄξιον δὲ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἣν διέξεισι περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας Ἰάκωβός τις ἐπελθεῖν. Whence he reckons Joseph inter τοὺς χηρεύοντας, and Epiphanius calls Ἰάκωβος Ἑβραῖος. *Lib. de Vita B. Mariæ Virg.* St. Jerom therefore observing that the former opinion of Joseph's sons was founded merely upon an apocryphal writing, and being ready to assert the virginity of Joseph as well as Mary, first invented the other solution in the kindred of Mary, as founded not only in the language, but also testimony of the Scriptures. 'Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, et quandam Escham mulierculam confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus materteræ Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris et Joseph et Judæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat.' *S. Hieron. in Matt.* xii. 49. [vol. vii. p. 86 B.] After St. Jerom St. Augustin embraced this opinion: 'Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos et cognationis propinquos.' *Tract.* 28. *in Joan.* [§. 3. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 508 E.] *item Tract.* 10. *et cont. Faust. lib.* xxii. *cap.* 35. [vol. viii. p. 383.] Although therefore he seem to be indifferent in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, i. 15. [§. 8. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 946 A.] 'Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus, debet intelligi:' yet because this Exposition was written while he was a presbyter, and those before mentioned after he was made a bishop, therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and St. Jerom's authority hath been generally since received in the Latin Church.

28 From this place Helvidius argued, 'Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominari, et eosdem esse fratres Domini, filios Mariæ.' [§. 11. p. 217 A.] And from the next he concluded, 'Ecce Jacobus et Joses, filii Mariæ, quos Judæi fratres appellarunt.' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [vol. ii. p. 217 D.]

undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also as unquestionably the sons of Mary: for among the women
Matt.xxvii. 56. at the cross we find *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses.* Again, this Mary they think can be no other than the mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the
Mark xvi. 1. morning at the sepulchre with *Mary Magdalene* and *Salome*, and it is not probable that any should have more care of the body of the son than the mother[29]. She then who was certainly present at the cross, was not probably absent from the sepulchre: wherefore they conclude she was the mother of Christ, who was the mother of James and Joses, the brethren of Christ.

And now the urging of this argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For if it appear that Mary the mother of James and Joses was different and distinguished from Mary the Virgin; then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Joses were so called. But we
John xix. 25. read in St. John, that *there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.* In the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same
Matt.xxvii. 56. place *Mary Magdalene*, and *Mary the mother of James and Joses;*
Mark xv. 40. and again at the sepulchre, *Mary Magdalene and the other Mary:*
Mat.xxviii. 1. wherefore that *other Mary* by the conjunction of these testimonies appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary[30], and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding therefore all these pretensions, there can

[29] Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, 'Quam miserum erit et impium de Maria hoc sentire, ut cum aliæ fœminæ curam sepulturæ Jesu habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [vol. ii. p. 218 A.]

[30] 'Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore, ut autem mihi videtur, Mariæ sororis matris Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius.' *S. Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccles.* 2. [vol. ii. p. 815 A.] 'Sicut in sepulchro ubi positum est corpus Domini, nec antea nec postea mortuus jacuit: sic uterus Mariæ nec antea nec postea quicquam mortale concepit.' *S. August. Tract.* 28. *in Joan.** [vol. iii. part ii. p. 508 F.]

* [There was a tradition, that Joseph and Cleophas were brothers, each of whom married a wife named Mary. Hegesippus *apud Eus. H. E.* III. II. IV. 22. Epiphan. *Hær.* LXXVIII. 7. p. 1039 A.]

be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed Mary's perpetual virginity. For as she was
177 a Virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth our Saviour; so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was commended by our Saviour to his beloved Disciple, as a mother only now of an adopted son.

The third consideration belonging to this part of the Article is, how this Virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternal relation to the Son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred nativity, beside the immediate work of the power of the Highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost, and the Virgin Mary;* as also that the word *born* was not taken precisely for the nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his human generation; and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the nativity to the Virgin, it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit. Γεννηθέντα.

First therefore, we must acknowledge a true, real, and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her own substance[31] the true and real substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive,* Isa. vii. 14. and the annunciation of the angel, *Behold, thou shalt conceive in* Luke i. 31. *thy womb*[32]. From whence our Saviour is expressly termed by Elizabeth, *the fruit of her womb.* Luke i. 42. Heb. פרי בטן

Secondly, as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and increase the same body of our Saviour,

31 'Quamvis tantum ad nativitatem carnis ex se daret, quantum ex se fœminæ edendorum corporum susceptis originibus impenderent.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* x. *cap.* 15. [p. 1045 B.]

32 That is, by a proper conception, Συλλαβεῖν ἐν γαστρί, the Syriac in one word בטן, ac si diceres, *ventrescere.* So the LXX. translated the simple הרה, ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται. As therefore ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν expresseth a proper gravidation, so doth ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαβεῖν a proper conception. According to that expression of Gregory Nazianzen, Θεϊκῶς μὲν, ὅτι χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς, ἀνθρωπικῶς δὲ, ὅτι νόμῳ κυήσεως. *Epist.* 1. *ad Cledon.** [Ep. ci. vol. ii. p. 85 C.]

* [It appears that there were discussions upon this point in early times: τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μεχρὶ νῦν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριὰμ λεχὼ εἶναι διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γένησιν, οὐκ οὖσα λεχώ· καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσαν φασί τινες παρθένον εὑρεθῆναι. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII. 16. [vol. ii.] p. 889. Tertullian, however, did not hold such a notion, 'Virgo quantum a viro, non virgo quantum a partu.' *De Carne Christi,* 23. [p. 324 C.] See Suicer, v. Μαρία. Beausobre, *Hist. de Manichée,* vol. i. p. 361.]

Matt. i. 18. once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which *she was found with child of the Holy Ghost,* and is described going
Luke ii. 5. οὔσῃ ἐγκύῳ. with *Joseph to be taxed, being great with child,* and pronounced
Luke xi. 27. ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε. happy by that loud cry of the woman in the Gospel, *Blessed is the womb that bare thee.*

Thirdly, when Christ was thus conceived and grew in the womb of the blessed Virgin, she truly and really did bring forth her son by a true and proper parturition; and Christ thereby was properly born by a true nativity[33]. For as we read,
Luke i. 57. *Elizabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son;* so in the like simplicity of expression, and
Luke ii. 6, 7. propriety of speech, the same Evangelist speaks of Mary, *The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son.*

Wherefore from these three, a true conception, nutrition, and parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed Virgin was truly and properly[34] the mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently styled the mother of Jesus in the language of
Luke i. 43. the Evangelists, and by Elizabeth particularly the *mother of her Lord,* as also by the general consent of the Church (because he which was so born of her was God[35],) the *Deipara*[36]; which

33 Πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.* [§. 1.]

34 'Veri et proprii filii quis nisi absurdissimus neget vere et proprie esse matrem?' *Facund. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [p. 671 B.] 'Hoc et ad credendum difficile, et dignum controversia videbatur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: cæterum quod vere et proprie genuerit, quicquid est ille quem genuit, nulli dignum disceptationis apparet.' *Ibid.*

35 Πῶς γὰρ οὐ Θεοτόκος ἡ Θεὸν υἱὸν ἔχουσα; *Theod. Abucara, Disput.* 14. [p. 407 D.]

36 This name was first in use in the Greek Church, who, delighting in the happy compositions of that language, called the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκον. From whence the Latins in imitation styled her *Virginem Deiparam et Deigenitricem.* Meursius in his Glossary sets the original of this title in the time of Justinian: 'Inditum hoc nomen est matri Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi a Synodo V. Constantinopolitana tempore Justiniani.' Whereas this was not the original, but the confirmation, of that title. 'In hac Synodo Catholice est institutum, ut beata Maria semper virgo Θεοτόκος diceretur: quia, sicut Catholica fides habet, non hominem solum, sed vere Deum et hominem, genuit.' *Paul. Warnef. de Gest. Longobard. lib.* vi. *cap.* 14. [p. 187 E.] So speaketh he of the same Synod: and it is true, for the seventh Canon of the same runneth thus, Εἴ τις καταχρηστικῶς—Θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν ἔνδοξον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν· ἢ κατὰ ἀναφορὰν—ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογεῖ—ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. [Mansi ix. p. 380 C.] Otherwise in this Council was but confirmed what had been determined and settled long before: and therefore Photius says thereof, *Epist.* 1. [p. 11.] Αὕτη ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος Νεστορίου πάλιν τὰ μιαρὰ παραφυόμενα δόγματα εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἐξεθέρισε, that it utterly cut off the heresy of Nestorius, which then began to grow up again. Now part of

178 being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved

the heresy of Nestorius was the denial of this Θεοτόκος, and the whole was nothing else but the ground of that denial. And therefore being he was condemned for denying of it, that title must be acknowledged authentic, which he denied, from the time of the Council of Ephesus; in which those Fathers, saith Photius expressly, τὴν πανάχραντον καὶ ἀειπαρθένον (Χριστοῦ) μητέρα κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς καλεῖσθαι καὶ ἀνευφημεῖσθαι Θεοτόκον παραδεδώκασι. *Epist.* I. [p. 8.] And that it was so then is manifest, because by the denial of this the Nestorian heresy was first discovered, not in Nestorius himself, but in his presbyter Anastasius, who first in a sermon magisterially delivered, Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλείτω μηδείς. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* vii. *cap.* 32. [p. 380.] and *Liberat. Breviar. cap.* 4. as also Evagrius and Nicephorus. Upon which words arising a tumult, Nestorius took his presbyter's part, teaching the same doctrine constantly in the Church, καὶ πανταχοῦ τὴν λέξιν τοῦ Θεοτόκος ἐκβάλλων. And hereupon the tumult grew so great, that a general Council for that reason was called by Theodosius Junior, τοῦ Νεστορίου τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρίαν εἶναι Θεοτόκον ἀρνουμένου, as Justinian testifieth, *Epist. ad V. Syn.* [Mansi ix. p. 179.] In which, when all things seemed clearly to be carried against Nestorius and his faction, he hoped to have reconciled all by this feigned acknowledgment, Λεγέσθω καὶ Θεοτόκος ἡ Μαρία, καὶ παυσάσθω τὰ λυπηρά. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* vii. *cap.* 34. *Liberat. Breviar. cap.* 6. It is plain then that the Council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, confirmed this title Θεοτόκος; I say, confirmed it; for it is evident that it was before used in the Church, by the tumult which arose at the first denial of it by Anastasius; and so confirmed it as received before, because they approved the Epistles of St. Cyril, who proved it by the usage of those Fathers which preceded him. Where by the way it is observable, that while St. Cyril produceth nine several Fathers for the use of this word, and both before and after he produceth them, affirmeth that they all did use it, there are but three of them who expressly mention it, Athanasius, Antiochus, and Ammon: *Epist. ad Reginas.* [vol. v. pt. ii. p. 48.] And it is something to be admired that he should so name the other six, and recite those places out of them which had it not, when there were before him so many beside them that used it. As Gregory Nazianzen, Εἴ τις οὐ Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν ὑπολαμβάνει, χωρίς ἐστι τῆς θεότητος. *Epist.* I. *ad Cledon.* [Ep. CI. vol. ii. p. 85 B.] and in his first Oration *de Filio*, speaking of the difference of his generation from that of others, Ποῦ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς σοῖς ἔγνως Θεοτόκον παρθένον; and St. Basil asserteth, μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοὴν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ Θεοτόκος. *Homil. de Nativ. Christi.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.] And that in the time of St. Basil and St. Gregory this term was usual, appeareth by the objection of Julian, who derided the Christians for thinking God could be born of a woman; Θεοτόκον δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐ παύεσθε Μαρίαν καλοῦντες. *S. Cyril. Alex. cont. Julian. lib.* viii. [vol. vi. p. 262 D.]* Before both these Eusebius speaketh of Helena, who built a church at Bethlehem; βασιλὶς ἡ θεοσεβεστάτη τῆς Θεοτόκου τὴν κύησιν μνήμασι θαυμαστοῖς κατεκόσμει. *De Vita Constant. lib.* iii. *cap.* 43.* [p. 601.] And before Eusebius, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria: Ἀπαρχὴ γέγονεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς, καὶ οὐ δοκήσει, ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. *Epist. ad Alex. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. cap. 4. [p. 20.] Before him Dionysius Alexandrinus calls our Saviour τὸν σαρκωθέντα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. *Epist. ad Paulum Samosat.* [p. 211. ed. 1796.] And speaking of the words of Isaiah, *A Virgin shall conceive*, Δείκνυσιν ὅτι ἡ Θεοτόκος τινὰ συνέλαβεν, ἡ παρθένος δηλονότι. *Resp. ad Quæst.* 5. [p. 238.] And in the answer to the same question, Πνεύ-

* [Eusebius also used the term in his treatise *cont. Marcell.* II. I. p. 32, and in two works published by Angelo Mai, *Romæ*, 1825. *Quæst. ad Marinum*, (vol. i. p. 69.) *Caten. in Matt.* (ib. p. 83.)]

into its parts by the Latins, and so the Virgin was plainly named the mother of God[37].

ματι ἁγίῳ ἤδρασται, καὶ σκέπεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὑψίστου ἡ ἀείμνηστος σκηνὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Μαρία ἡ Θεοτόκος, καὶ παρθένος. [p. 240.] And again, *Οὕτωσὶ λέγει καὶ περὶ τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου.* [ib.] In the answer to the sixth question, *Διὰ τὸ φεύγειν εἰς Αἴγυπτον τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἅμα τῇ Θεοτόκῳ Μαρίᾳ ἐν ἀγκάλαις φερούσῃ τὴν καταφυγὴν ἡμῶν.* [p. 245.] and so often*. Nay yet before him Origen did not only use, but expound at large the meaning of that title *Θεοτόκος*, in his first tome on the Epistle to the Romans, as Socrates and Liberatus testify†. Well therefore did Antiochus [John] Bishop of Antioch urge the ancient fathers against Nestorius, calling it *πρόσφορον ὄνομα καὶ τετριμμένον πολλοῖς τῶν πατέρων.* And again, *Πολλοῖς τῶν πατέρων καὶ συντεθὲν, καὶ γραφὲν, καὶ ῥηθέν. Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα,* says he, *οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν διδασκάλων παρήτηται· οἵ τε γὰρ χρησάμενοι αὐτῷ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐπίσημοι, οἵ τε μὴ χρησάμενοι οὐκ ἐπελάβοντο τῶν χρησαμένων. Concil. Ephes. par.* I. *cap.* 25. [Mansi iv. pp. 1064, 1065.]

37 Although *Θεοτόκος* may be extended to signify as much as the *Mother of God*, because *τίκτειν* doth sometimes denote as much as *γεννᾶν*, and therefore it hath been translated *Dei genitrix*, as well as *Deipara;* yet those ancient Greeks which called the Virgin *Θεοτόκος*, did not call her *μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ*‡. But the Latins translating *Θεοτόκος Dei genitrix*, and the Greeks translating *Dei genitrix Θεοῦ μήτηρ*, they both at last called her plainly the *Mother of God*. The first which the Greeks observed to style her so was Leo the Great, as was observed by Ephraim Patriarch of Theopolis, whose words have been very much mistaken by two learned men, Dionysius Petavius and Leo Allatius, who have produced them to prove that he thought Leo Magnus was the first man which ever used the word *Θεοτόκος*. A strange error this must needs appear in so great a person as a Patriarch, and that of the Greek Church; and indeed not imaginable, considering how well he was versed in those controversies, and how he compared the words of Leo with those of the ancient Greek Fathers, and particularly of St. Cyril. His words are these in his Epistle *ad Zenobium*, *Πρῶτος ἐν ἁγίοις Λέων ἰδικῶς εἶπεν αὐταῖς λέξεσιν, ὡς μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἁγία Θεοτόκος, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατέρων διαπρυσίοις ῥήμασι μὴ τοῦτο φαμένων.* [in Phot. Bibl. 228.] That is, *Leo was the first who in plain terms called the Θεοτόκος* (that is, Mary) *the* Mother of God; *whereas the Fathers before him spake not the same in express words.* Petavius and Allatius have clearly mistaken the proposition, making the subject the predicate, and the predicate the subject, as if he had first called the *Mother of God Θεοτόκος*, whereas he is said first to call the *Θεοτόκος Mother of God*, as appeareth by the article added to the subject, not to the predicate. But if that be not sufficient, his meaning will appear by another passage to the same purpose, in his Epistle *ad Syncleticum; Ὅτι μητέρα Θεοῦ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἀνεῖπεν, ἐν οἷς λέγει, Καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου ἔλθῃ πρός με; σαφέστερον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν λέξιν πρῶτος ὁ ὅσιος Λέων ὁ Πάπας προήνεγκε.* Therefore as he took the *Lord* and *God* to be synonymous; so he thought Elizabeth first styled Mary the *Mother of God*, because she called her the *Mother of her Lord;* and after Elizabeth, Leo was the first who plainly styled her so, that is, the *Mother of God*. And that we may be yet farther assured of his mind, he produceth the words of Leo the Pope in his Epistle to Leo the

* [The places may be seen at p. 261, 264, 274.]

† [It is also used by Origen *in Deut.* xxii. 23. vol. ii. p. 391 A. in Luc. apud Galland. *Biblioth. Patr.* vol. xiv. append. p. 87 D. Also by Hippolytus, apud Routh. *Reliq. Sacr.* vol. ii. p. 215.]

‡ [Yet Dionysius calls Mary *ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου. cont. Paul. Samos.* quæst. 8. p. 265.]

The necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of the Virgin Mary*, will appear both in respect of her who was the mother, and of him who was the son.

In respect of her it was therefore necessary, that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to
179 so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, *From henceforth* Luke i. 48.
all generations shall call me blessed[38]; but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out *with* so *loud* Luke i. 42.
a voice, Blessed art thou among women, when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb; what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that mother with him[39]! Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other[40]. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the *mother of our Lord,* so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive Church: Let her be honoured and esteemed, let him be worshipped and adored[41].

In respect of him it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was *made,* or *begotten of a woman,* and consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. *For he took not* Heb. ii. 16.
on him the nature of angels, and therefore saved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are *reserved in everlasting chains* Jude 6.

Emperor: Ἀναθεματιζέσθω Νεστόριος, ὁ τὴν μακαρίαν καὶ Θεοτόκον Μαρίαν οὐχὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀνθρώπου δὲ μόνον πιστεύων εἶναι μητέρα. [Ibid.] The sentence which he translates is this, 'Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo, credidit genitricem.' *Epist.* xcvii. *cap.* 1. [Ep. cxxxiv. c. ii. vol. i. p. 698.] where plainly *genitrix Dei* is translated μήτηρ Θεοῦ, and Θεοτόκος is added by Ephraim out of custom in the subject, being otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek Church they termed the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and the Latins from them *Dei genitrix,* and *mater Dei,* and the Greeks from them again μήτηρ Θεοῦ, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice of other Latins who styled her so before him.

38 'Non æquanda est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem.' *Auctor lib. de singular. Clericorum.* [§. 26.]

39 'Elisabet et Zacharias nos docere possunt, quanto inferiores sunt beatæ Mariæ matris Domini sanctitate, quæ conscientia in se habitantis Dei libere proclamat, *Ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes.*' *S. Hieron. adv. Pelag. lib.* i. [§. 16. vol. ii. p. 698 A.]

40 'Absit ut quisquam S. Mariam divinæ gratiæ privilegiis et speciali gloria fraudare conetur.'

41 Ἐν τιμῇ ἔστω Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ, καὶ Υἱὸς, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα προσκυνείσθω· τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* lxxix. §. 7. [vol. i. p. 1064 D.] Εἰ καλλίστη ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἁγία, καὶ τετιμημένη, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι. *Ibid.* Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν μὲν ὁρωμένων θεολογοῦμεν οὐδέν· τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ διαπρέψαντας ὡς ἀνθρώπους ἀρίστους γεραίρομεν· μόνον δὲ τὸν τῶν ὅλων προσκυνοῦμεν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου γε λόγον, καὶ τὸ πανάγιον Πνεῦμα. *Theodoret. Therap. Serm.* 2. [vol. iv. p. 502 C.]

under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably condemned to the same condition, *but* that *he took upon him the seed of*
Heb. ii. 14. *Abraham.* For being we are *partakers of flesh and blood,* we could expect no redemption but by him who *likewise took part of the same:* we could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our brother[42]. And being there is but
1 Tim. ii. 5. *one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus,* we cannot be assured that he was the Christ, or is our Jesus, except we be first assured that he was a man. Thus our Redeemer, the Man Christ Jesus, was born of a woman, that he might redeem both men and women[43]; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceived and born of such a woman, as was a most pure and immaculate Virgin. For as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us; so in that great similitude a dissimilitude
Heb. iv. 15. was as necessary, that he should be *without sin*[44]. *Our Pass-*
1 Cor. v. 7. *over is slain,* and *behold the Lamb that taketh away the sins of*
John i. 29. *the world;*
Exod. xii. 5. but the Lamb of the passover must be *without blemish.* Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a Virgin without any seminal tra-
Heb. vii. 26. duction. Our High Priest is *separate from sinners,* not only in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as Levi was in the loins of Abraham[45], and paid tithes in him,

42 Under that notion did the ancient Jews expect him, as appeareth by the Targum. Cantic. viii. 1. ובההיא זמנא אתגלי מלכא משיחא לכנשתא דישראל וייתמרון ליה בני ישראל אתא תהא עמנא לאח *And at that time the king Messias shall reveal himself to the congregation of Israel, and the sons of Israel shall say unto him, Come, be unto us a brother.*

43 'Hominis liberatio in utroque sexu debuit apparere. Ergo, quia virum oportebat suscipere, qui sexus honorabilior est, consequens erat ut fœminei sexus liberatio hinc appareret, quod ille vir de fœmina natus est.' *S. August. Lib. de divers. quæst.* lxxxiii. *quæst.* 11. [vol. vi. p. 4 B.] 'Nolite vos ipsos contemnere, viri, filius Dei virum suscepit: nolite vos ipsas contemnere, fœminæ, filius Dei natus ex fœmina est.' *Idem de Agone Christiano.* [c. xi. §. 12. vol. vi. p. 251 F.]

44 'Non eum in peccatis mater ejus in utero aluit; quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit.' *S. August. Tract.* 4. *in Joan.* [§. 10. vol. iii. part ii. p. 316 G.] 'Ergo *ecce Agnus Dei.* Non habet iste traducem de Adam; carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit.' *Ibid.* [p. 317 A.] 'Verbum caro factum in similitudine carnis peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium ferens ex traduce prævaricationis exortum.' *Joan. IV. Epist. ad Constant.* [p. 32 C.]

45 'Levi [in lumbis Abrahæ fuit,] secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam sub-

and yet Christ, though the Son of Abraham, did not pay tithes
180 in him, but receive them in Melchizedeck: so though we being in the loins of Adam may be all said to sin in him; yet Christ, who descended from the same Adam according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent, is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions: but he who is only from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediential power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that Virgin Mary which was espoused unto Joseph, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of David. For whatsoever promises were made of the Messias, were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of Abraham, so the seed of Abraham was next appropriated to the Son of David. He was to *be called the Son of the Highest*, and *the Lord God* was to *give unto him the throne of his father David.* When Jesus asked the Pharisees, *What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* *they said unto him, The Son of David.* When Herod demanded of the chief Priests and Scribes *where Christ should be born; they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judæa*, because that was *the city of David*, whither Joseph went up with Mary his espoused wife, *because he was of the house and lineage of David.* After John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, Zacharias *blessed the Lord God of Israel*, who had *raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David.* The *woman of Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way*, and those other *blind that followed him cried out, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David.* The very children, out of whose mouths God perfected praise, were *crying in the temple, and saying, Hosannah to the Son of David.* And when the blind and dumb both spake and saw, *all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the Son*

Luke i. 32.
Matt. xxii. 42.
Matt. ii. 4, 5.
Luke ii. 4.
Luke i. 68, 69.
Matt. xv. 22: xx. 30: ix. 27.
Matt. xxi. 15.
Matt. xii. 23.

stantiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine et visibilis corpulentia et invisibilis ratio, utrumque cucurrit ex Abraham, vel etiam ex ipso Adam, usque ad corpus Mariæ, quia et ipsum eo modo conceptum et exortum est: Christus autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit; ratio vero conceptionis ejus non a semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit.' *S. August. de Genes. ad lit. lib.* x. *cap.* 20. [§. 35. vol. iii. part i. p. 270 D.].

of David? Thus by the public and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews, the promised Messias was to come of the house
Acts ii. 30. and lineage of David; for *God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne*[46]. It was therefore necessary we
Rom. i. 3. should believe that our Saviour *was made of the seed of David according to the flesh:* of which we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused unto Joseph, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy might be known.

The consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter branch of the Article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to profess, and being informed, fully express what is the object of his faith in this particular, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ which was *born of the Virgin Mary.* For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I assent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, that there was a certain woman, known by the name of Mary, espoused unto Joseph of Nazareth, which before and after her espousals was a pure and unspotted Virgin, and being and continuing in the same virginity, did, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, conceive within her womb the only begotten Son of God, and, after the natural time of other women, brought him forth as her first-born Son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate Virgin; whereby the 181
Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the Law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which was of the house and lineage of David, that he might sit upon his throne and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *born of the Virgin Mary.*

[46] 'Atquin hinc magis Christum intelligere debebis ex David deputatum carnali genere, ob Mariæ Virginis censum. De hoc enim promisso juratur in Psalmo ad David, *Ex fructu ventris tui collocabo super thronum tuum.*' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 20. [p. 409 A.]

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

THIS Article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of Christ's humiliation. For the first word of it, now generally speaking of his passion, in the most ancient Creeds was no way distinguished from his crucifixion; for as we say, *suffered* and *crucified*, they only, *crucified under Pontius Pilate*[47]: nor was his crucifixion distinguished from his death, but where we read, *crucified, dead, and buried*, they only, *crucified and buried*. Because the chief of his sufferings were on the cross, and he gave up the ghost there; therefore his whole passion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

But again, being he suffered not only on the cross; being it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed tree, and yet not have died; therefore the Church thought fit to add the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as consequent to his crucifixion.

47 'Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 14. p. ccix.] *Cassian. de Incarn. Domini.* 'Credimus in eum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap.* 5. [vol. vi. p. 156.] *et de Trin. lib.* i. *cap.* 14. [c. 13. §. 28. vol. viii. p. 767.] 'Caput nostrum Christus est, crucifixum et sepultum, resuscitatum ascendit in cœlum.' *Idem in Psal.* cxxxii. [vol. iv. p. 1488 A.] 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *Max. Taurin. Chrysol. Euseb. Gallic.* [Hom. ii. p. 554.] Τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, ταφέντα. 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *MSS. Armach.* And beside these, a witness without exception, Leo the Great; 'Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur.' *Epist.* x. *cap.* 5. Afterwards the passion was expressed: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus et sepultus:' *Etherius Uxam.* [p. 344 E.] and the death: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus.' *Auctor lib. de Symb. ad Catechum.* [c. iii. §. 6. S. Aug. vol. vi. p. 550 C.] Not but both these were expressed before in the rule of Faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the crucifixion. 'Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum.' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 2. [p. 501 B.] As Optatus, 'Passus, mortuus, et sepultus resurrexit.' *lib.* i. [c. i. p. 2.] 'Passus, sepultus, et tertia die resurrexit.' *Capitul. Caroli* 82. And generally the ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his suffering. For as Marcellus and St. Cyril have σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, Eusebius and the Nicene Council to the same purpose have παθόντα only in their Creeds. As St. Clemens Alexandrinus, Τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν πίστιν, τὴν εἰς τὸν παθόντα ὁμολογίαν. *Pæd. lib.* ii. *cap.* 3. [vol. i. p. 189.] Which was farther enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθέντα, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα.

To begin then with his passion in general. In those words, He *suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as substantial, part as circumstantial. The substance of this part of the Article consisteth in our Saviour's passion, He *suffered:* the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present governor, *under Pontius Pilate.*

Now for the explication of our Saviour's passion, as distinct from those particulars which follow in the Article, more, I conceive, cannot be required than that we shew, *who* it was that suffered, *how* he suffered, *what* it was he suffered.

First, if we would clearly understand him that suffered in his full relation to his passion, we must consider him both in his office and his person; as Jesus Christ, and as the only-begotten Son of God. In respect of his office, we believe that he which was the Christ did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering Messias. Of which that we may give a just account, first, we must prove that the promised Messias was to suffer: for if he were not, then by professing that our Jesus suffered, we should declare he was not Christ. 182
Secondly, we must shew that Jesus, whom we believe to be the Messias, did really and truly suffer: for if he did not, then while we proved the true Messias was to suffer, we should conclude our Jesus was not that Messias. Thirdly, it will farther be advantageous for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the Messias were determined and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And fourthly, it will then be necessary to shew that our Jesus did truly suffer whatsoever was so determined and foretold. And more than this cannot be necessary to declare *who* it was that suffered, in relation to his office.

For the first of these, that the promised Messias was to suffer, to all Christians it is unquestionable; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the doctrine which St. Paul disseminated through the world was this, *that the Christ must needs have suffered.*

Mark ix. 12.
Luke xxiv. 26, 46.
Acts xvii. 3.

But because these testimonies will satisfy only such as believe in Jesus, and our Saviour himself did refer the disbelieving Jews to the Law and the Prophets, as those who testified of him; we will shew from thence, even from the oracles committed to the

Jews, *how it was written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things;* and how *the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ.* Mark ix. 12. 1 Pet. i. 11.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is beyond all question a sad, but clear, description of a suffering person: *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living.* But the person of whom that chapter treateth was certainly the Messias, as we have formerly proved by the confession of the most ancient Jews[48], and may farther be evidenced both

48 Page 155, note 57, we shewed by the authority of the Targum, the *Bereshith Rabba,* and the *Midrash* upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Jarchi and Moses Alshech, that the ancient Rabbins did interpret that chapter of the Messias; which might seem a sufficient acknowledgment. But because this is the most considerable controversy between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by farther testimonies. In the Talmud, *Cod. Sanhedrin,* [fol. 98vo.] to the question, *What is the name of the Messias?* it is answered, היוורא *the Leper.* And the reason of the name is there rendered, שנאמר *because it is spoken in this,* Isa. liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken,* i. e. נגוע. And because הנגע is used of the leprosy, Levit. xiii. 13. therefore from נגוע they concluded his name to be a *Leper,* and consequently did interpret that place of the Messias. In the *Pesikta* it is written, הוציא ה׳בה נשמת המשיח *God produced the soul of the Messias, and said unto him, Wilt thou redeem my sons after* 6000 *years? He answered, I will. Wilt thou bear the chastisements, to take away their sins?* ההוא דכתיב אכן חלינו הוא נשא *As it is written,* Isa. liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs. And he answered, I will bear them with joy.* Which is a clear testimony, considering the opinion of the Jews that all souls of men were created in the beginning, and so the soul of the Messias to suffer for the rest. The shift of the Jews, turning these expressions off from the Messias, and attributing of them to the people as to one, is something ancient: for we find that Origen was urged with that exposition in a disputation with the Jews. Μέμνημαι δέ ποτε ἔν τινι πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφοὺς ἐκζητήσει ταῖς προφητείαις ταύταις χρησάμενος· ἐφ' οἷς ἔλεγεν ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ταῦτα πεπροφητεῦσθαι ὡς περὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ ὅλου λαοῦ, καὶ γενομένου ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, καὶ πληγέντος, ἵνα πολλοὶ προσήλυτοι γένωνται, τῇ προφάσει τοῦ ἐπεσπάρθαι Ἰουδαίους τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔθνεσι. Thus the Jew interpreted those places, Isa. lii. 14. *His visage was so marred more than any man;* lii. 15. *That which had not been told them shall they see;* liii. 3. *A man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief:* and applied them to the people of Israel in their dispersions. But Origen did easily refute him, by retorting other places of the same prophecy, as liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;* verse 5. *He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, and with his stripes are we healed.* Σαφῶς γάρ, says he, οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις γενόμενοι, καὶ ἰαθέντες, ἐκ τοῦ τὸν σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι, εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκείνου, εἴτε καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ταῦτα λέγουσι. But especially he confounded the Jew with those words of the 8th verse, *He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgressions of my people was he stricken.* Μάλιστα δὲ ἐδόξαμεν θλίβειν, ἀπὸ τῆς φασκούσης λέξεως τὸ, Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἦχθη εἰς θάνατον. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ λαὸς κατ' ἐκείνους εἰσὶν οἱ προφητευόμενοι, πῶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγεται ἦχθαι εἰς θάνατον οὗτος, εἰ μὴ ἕτερος ὢν παρὰ τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ; τίς δ' οὗτος εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* i. [c. 55. vol. i. p. 370.]

from them, and from the place itself. For surely no man's *soul* can be *made an offering for* our *sins*, but our Saviour's: nor hath God *laid on* any man *the iniquity of us all*, but on our Redeemer. *Upon* no person but the Messias could *the chastisement of our peace* be; nor *with* any *stripes* could *we* be *healed* but his. It is sufficiently then demonstrated by the Prophet, that the suffering Person whom he describes was to be the Christ, in that he *bare our griefs*, and *carried our sorrows*.

This prediction is so clear, ever since the *serpent* was to *bruise* 183
the heel of the woman's *seed*, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a Messias which should be only glorious, have been forced to invent another, which should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention; That a Messias was to redeem us, and a Messias was to suffer for us: but the same Messias was not both to redeem us and to suffer for us. For they say that there are two several persons promised under the name of the Messias[49]; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of the tribe of Judah; one the Son of Joseph, the other the Son of David; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death, the other to follow, conquer, triumph, reign, and never to die. If then our Saviour were a Christ, we must confess he was a suffering Messias, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the Son of David, then, say they, he was never to die; or if he ever died, he was not that Messias which was promised to sit upon the throne of David. And while we confess our Saviour died, and

[49] So indeed the Jews expect a double Messias, one, משיח בן יוסף *Messias the son of Joseph*, the other, משיח בן דוד *Messias the son of David*. So the Targum expressly upon the Canticles iv. 5. תרין פריקיך דעתידין למפרקיך משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים *Two are thy deliverers which shall deliver thee, Messias the son of David, and Messias the son of Ephraim:* and in the same manner, chap. vii. 3. This that Paraphrast, nothing so ancient as the rest, is conceived to have taken out of the Talmud in *Massecheth Succa* [fol. 52 vo.] where, *cap.* 5. inscribed החליל, God saith to Messias the son of David, שאל מה אחה מבקש *Ask what thou wilt*, (according to the second Psalm,) *and I will give it thee.* כיון שראה משיח בן יוסף שנהרג *Who seeing Messias the son of Joseph which was slain, asked of God nothing but life.* Thus from the Talmud and the later Targum the Rabbins have generally taught a double Messias, one the son of David, the other of Joseph. As Solomon Jarchi, Isa. xxiv. 18. Zach. xii. 10. Aben Ezra, Zach. ix. 9. Malach. iii. 1. Kimchi, Zach. xii. 10. whom the later Jews constantly follow. And this Marcion the heretic seems to have learned of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. 'Constituit Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus a Deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium; alium, qui a Deo creatore in restitutionem Judaici status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 6. [p. 416 C.]

withal assert his descent from the house of David, we do, in their opinion, involve ourselves in a contradiction.

But this distinction of a double Messias is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in itself false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in itself false, will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any Messias of the tribe of Ephraim; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of Joseph. Beside, as we acknowledge but one Mediator between God and man, so the Scriptures never mention any Messias but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the *seed of the woman*, or *the seed of Abraham*, whether *Shiloh*, or *the son of David*, still one person promised: and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he *which is to come*. The question which was asked him, when he professed himself to be Christ, was, whether it was he which *was to come*, or whether they were to *look for another?* not that they could look for him and for another also. The objection then was, that Elias was not yet come, and therefore they expected no Messias till Elias came. Nor can the difference of the Messiah's condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the Prophets, speaking of the same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Being then, by the confession of all the Jews, one Messias was to be the Son of David, whom Elias was to precede; being by the tenor of the Scriptures there was never promise made of more Christs than one, and never the least mention of the tribe of Ephraim with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in itself false.

ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Matt. xi. 3. Zech. ix. 9. Isa. ix. 6.

Again, that the same distinction, framed and contrived against
184 us, must needs be in any indifferent person's judgment advantageous to us, will appear, because the very invention of a double person is a plain confession of a twofold condition; and the different relations, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the distinct economies, which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to die, and another to triumph, but that the true Messias was both to triumph and to die, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the rags of our infirmity

before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquered, and the other to be victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and, as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first assertion remaineth firm; the promised Messias was to suffer.

Secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, did suffer, we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it, the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so far from being denied, that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sins, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the annals of times, if the writings of his Apostles, if the death of his Martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles, if the scoffs of the Jews, be testimonies, Jesus suffered. Nor was there ever any which thought he did not really and truly suffer, but such as withal irrationally pretended he was not really and truly man[50].

50 Those which were called by the Greeks Δοκηταί and Φαντασιασταί, who taught that Christ was man only *putative*, and came into the world only *in phantasmate*, and consequently that he did only *putative pati*. These were called Δοκηταί, not from their author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things only ἐν δοκήσει, *in appearance*, not reality. As Clemens Alexandrinus, Τῶν αἱρέσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ δογμάτων ἰδιαζόντων προσαγορεύονται, ὡς ἡ τῶν Δοκητῶν. *Strom. lib.* vii. [c. 17. vol. ii. p. 900.] *viz.* οἱ δοκήσει Χριστὸν πεφανερῶσθαι ὑπέλαβον. *Idem. lib.* vi. 'Neque in phantasia, id est, absque carne, sicut Valentinus asserit, neque de thesi, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus.' *Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. cap.* 2. [S. Aug. vol. viii. App. p. 75 C.] where for *de thesi*, I suppose we should read δοκήσει. The original of this train of heretics is to be fetched from Simon Magus, whose assertion was 'Christum nec venisse, nec a Judæis quicquam pertulisse.' *S. August. Hæres.* 1.* Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, 'se in Filii persona putative apparuisse,' and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews; ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πεπονθέναι δὲ, ἀλλὰ δοκήσει μόνον. *Damasc. de Hæres.* Now what Simon Magus said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed affirmed of Christ. As Saturninus, who taught, 'Christum in substantia corporis non fuisse, et phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse.' *Tertul. de Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap.* 46. [p. 219 D.] *Vide*

* [The Benedictine editors reject these words, vol. viii. p. 6.]

Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgment of this truth, we shall farther shew that the promised Messias was not only engaged to suffer for us, but by a certain and express agreement betwixt him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determined, in order to the redemption itself which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved, was before his coming in the flesh revealed to the Prophets, and written by them, in order to the reception of the Messias, and the acceptation of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the Messias was to undergo for us was predetermined and decreed, appeareth by the timely acknowledgment of the Church unto the Father; *Of a truth, against thy holy child* Acts iv. 27, 28.
185 *Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.* For as when the two goats were presented before Lev. xvi. 8.
the Lord, that goat was to be offered for a sin-offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the high priest, and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to die: so the *hand* of God is said to have *determined* what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering. And well may we say that the *hand* of God as well as his *counsel determined* his passion, because he was *delivered by the determinate counsel and* Acts ii. 23.
foreknowledge of God.

Epiph.-mutilum, Hæres. xxiii. §. 1. [p. 62.] And Basilides, who delivered, *εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν φαντασίαν ἐν τῷ φαίνεσθαι, μὴ εἶναι δὲ ἄνθρωπον, μηδὲ σάρκα εἰληφέναι—οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν φάσκων πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ Σίμωνα τὸν Κυρηναῖον. S. Epiph. Hæres.* xxiv. §. 3. [p. 70 D.] 'A Judæis non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus.' *S. August. Hæres.* 4.* Thus the Valentinians, particularly Marcus, the father of the Marcosian heretics: 'Marcus etiam nescio quis hæresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non vere, sed putative, passum asseverans.' *S. August. Hæres.* 14. [vol. viii. p. 8 C.] Thus Cerdon; 'Christum in substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronunciat, nec omnino passum, sed quasi passum.' *Tertul. de Præscr. Hæret. cap.* 51. [p. 222 D.] 'Christum ipsum neque natum ex fœmina, neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passionem.' *S. August. Hæres.* 21. [p. 9 B.] And the Manichees, who taught, 'Christum—non fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuisse; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem, mentiretur.' *Idem, Hæres.* 46. [p. 16 F.] Whom therefore Vincentius Lirinensis calls 'Phantasiæ prædicatores,' *cap.* 20. [p. 242 F.]

* [The Benedictine editors reject these words, vol. viii. p. 6.]

And this determination of God's counsel was thus made upon a covenant or agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is expressed by the Prophet,

Isa. liii. 10. *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed,*

Heb. x. 7. *he shall prolong his days;* partly by the Apostle, *Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.* In the condition of *making his soul an offering for sin,* we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptation, *Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,* we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour's passion was made by covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered.

And as the sufferings of the Messias were thus agreed on by consent, and determined by the counsel of God; so they were revealed by the Spirit of God unto the Prophets, and by them delivered to the Church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the prophecies spoken by God in the mouths of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. St. Paul's apology was clear, that he

Acts xxvi. 22, 23. *said none other things but those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer.* The Prophets *said* in express terms that the Messias, whom they foretold, should suffer; Moses *said* so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the passover to be slain, he *said* that Shiloh was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen serpent up in the wilderness, he *said,* the Son of Man should be lifted up upon the cross. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he *said,* without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of Holies on the day of Atonement, he said, Christ, our High Priest, should never enter through the veil into the highest heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternal counsel of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of

that counsel, either in express predictions or ceremonial representations, we shall clearly see the truth of our third assertion, That the sufferings of the promised Messias were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agreed, determined, and revealed as belonging to the true Messias, were undergone by that Jesus of Nazareth, whom we believe to be the true Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he outwent not, never prediction of any passion which he fulfilled not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approached, he said to his Apo-
186 stles, *Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished.* Luke xviii. 31. When he delivered them the blessed sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, *Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was determined.* Luke xxii. 22. κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον. After his resurrection, he chastised the dulness of his Disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion, that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions; saying unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?* Luke xxiv. 25, 26. After his ascension St. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies, and saw his sufferings; *Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* Acts iii. 18. Whatsoever therefore was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets concerning the sufferings of the Messias, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be, and worship as, the Christ. Which is the fourth and last assertion propounded to express our Saviour's passion in relation to his office.

Having considered him that *suffered* in his office, we are next to consider him in his person. And being in all this Article there is no person expressly named or described, we must look back upon the former, till we find his description and his name. The Article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named Jesus, and described *the only-begotten Son* of God.

Now this Son of God we have already shewed to be therefore truly called the *Only-begotten*, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the

eternal Son, so also the eternal God. Wherefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles[51], and necessary consequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.* For it was no other person which *suffered under Pontius Pilate,* than he which was *born of the Virgin Mary;* he which was *born of the Virgin Mary,* was no other person than he *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost;* he *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost,* was no other person than *our Lord;* and that *our Lord* no other than the *only Son* of God: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that *the only Son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate.* That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulness of time being
1 Cor. ii. 8. made flesh, did suffer. For the *princes of this world crucified the*
Acts xx. 28. *Lord of glory*[52]; and *God purchased his church with his own blood.* That Person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of glory* and most truly *God,* took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry, than that Son of God which made the world; when he sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst, but he which was eternally begotten of the Father the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains, than that eternal Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the ghost, but the Son of
1 Tim. vi. 16. him, and so of the same nature with him, *who only hath immortality.* And thus we conclude our first consideration propounded, viz. Who it was which suffered; affirming that, in respect of his office, it was the Messias, in respect of his Person, it was God the Son.

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth requireth first a view of the second particular propounded, How, or in what he suffered. For while we prove the Person suffering 187
to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the

51 This is that *inseparabilis connexio* in the Creed, which Cassianus urgeth so much against Nestorius. *de Incarn. lib.* vi.

52 'Dominum passum symboli tenet auctoritas, et Apostolus tradidit, dicens, *Si enim cognovissent, nunquam Dominum gloriæ crucifixissent.*' *Vigil. adv. Eutych. lib.* ii. [c. 8. p. 20.]

perfection of the Godhead is incapable. The Divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion, as to deny that the Divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the Divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering.

Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as the *Word was made flesh,* though the Word was never made[53], (as being in the beginning God,) but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith St. Peter, *Christ suffered for us in the flesh,* in that nature of man which he took upon him: and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. For he was *put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit*[54]; suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As he *was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,* in the language of St. Paul; so was he *put to death in the flesh,* in the language of St. Peter: and as he was *declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness;* so was he *quickened by the Spirit.* Thus the proper subject and recipient of our Saviour's passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

John i. 14.

1 Pet. iv. 1.

1 Pet. iii. 18.

Rom. i. 3.

Rom. i. 4.

Far be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could suffer; which only hath immortality, could

53 Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο—ἵνα καὶ ὁ λόγος ἀεὶ ᾖ λόγος, καὶ σάρκα ἔχῃ ὁ λόγος, ἐν ᾗ τὸ πάθος καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἀνεδέξατο ἐν μορφῇ τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, μέχρι τάφου, καὶ ᾅδου ἐπιβάς. *S. Athanas. de Incarn. Dom. cont. Apol. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [vol. i. pt. ii. p. 932 B.]

54 'Adeo salva est utriusque proprietas substantiæ, ut et Spiritus res suas egerit in illo, id est, virtutes et opera et signa; et caro passiones suas functa sit, esuriens sub Diabolo, sitiens sub Samaritide, flens Lazarum, anxia usque ad mortem, denique et mortua est.' *Tertul. adv. Prax. cap.* 27. [p. 517 A.] *S. Clem. Alex. Pæd. lib.* i. *cap.* 5.

die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity; nor can that infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsical and essential perfections[55]. If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the least infirmity by any union with humanity[56]? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the Divine nature, as to conceive it capable of any diminution; nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word, as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation, as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian heretics[57], whom the Church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion, that all the sufferings of our Mediator were subjected in his human nature.

55 Τὸ γὰρ φύσει ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον ἀεὶ τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν, οὐ συναλλοιούμενον τῇ ταπεινῇ φύσει, ὅταν ἐν ἐκείνῃ κατ' οἰκονομίαν γένηται. *S. Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Eustath.* [vol. iii. p. 657 D.]

56 Ὡς οὐδ' ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς πάθοιέν τι ἀκτῖνες τὰ πάντα πληροῦσαι, καὶ σωμάτων νεκρῶν καὶ οὐ καθαρῶν ἐφαπτόμεναι· πολὺ πλέον ἡ ἀσώματος τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις οὔτ' ἂν πάθοι τὴν οὐσίαν, οὔτ' ἂν βλαβείη—σώματος ἀσωμάτως ἐπαφωμένη. *Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib.* iv. *cap.* 13. [p. 168 A.]

57 This danger is the rather to be unfolded, because it is not generally understood. The heresy of Arius, as it was condemned by the Council of Nice, is known to all. But that he made the nature of the Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly delivered. This Phœbadius (the first of the Latin Church who wrote against the Arians) chargeth them with. 'Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum, vultis videri; ut etiam unus vestrum, id est epistola Potamii, quæ ad orientem et occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit, carne et spiritu Christi coagulatis per sanguinem Mariæ, et in unum corpus redactis, passibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo, ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impassibilem satis constat.' *Lib. adv. Arianos, cap.* 7. [c. 5. p. 251 A.] And again; 'Non ergo sit spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod isti volunt egregii doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus et Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permixtione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilem volunt dici, ne ex impassibili credatur.' *cap.* 8. Μάτην οὖν Ἀρειανοὶ σοφίζονται σάρκα μόνην ὑποτιθέμενοι ἀνειληφέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, τὴν δὲ τοῦ πάθους νόησιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαθῆ θεότητα ἀναφέροντες ἀσεβῶς. *S. Athanas. de Incarn. Dom. cont. Apol. lib.* i. *cap.* 15. [vol. i. pt. ii. p. 935 B.] Of this St. Hilary is to be understood: 'Sed eorum omnis hic sensus est, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui asserunt non de æternitate esse prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ substantiæ exstitisse, sed ex nullo per eum qui omnia creavit effectum; ut assumptus ex nihilo sit, et cœptus ex opere, et confirmatus ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione.' *Com. in Mat. cap.* 31. [p. 742 B.] where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the only true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his, which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever since.

188 And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the Divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other[58]; and that upon good reason. For being the same individual Person is, by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth, that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *A man is God:* because in this particular he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably, that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the human nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by virtue of the same incarnation it is also proper to say, *A man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge, that all the essential attributes of the Divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God, to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the Divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the human nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties[59].

58 'Per indissolubilem unitatem Verbi et carnis, omnia quæ carnis sunt ascribuntur et Verbo, quomodo et quæ Verbi sunt prædicantur in carne.' *Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. lib.* i. *cap.* 1. [§. 6. p. 467 B.] Διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἑνότητα τῆς τε προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς, καὶ τῆς προσλαβομένης θεότητος, ἀντιμεθίστανται τὰ ὀνόματα· ὥστε καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῷ θείῳ, καὶ τὸ θεῖον τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ, κατονομάζεσθαι. *S. Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Theoph.* [vol. iii. p. 265 D.] Χρὴ μέντοι εἰδέναι ὡς ἡ ἕνωσις κοινὰ ποιεῖ τὰ ὀνόματα. *Theodoret. Dial.* iii. *cap.* 17. [vol. iv. p. 151 C.]

59 Called by the Schools ordinarily *Communicatio idiomatum:* by the ancient Greek divines Ἀντίδοσις, and sometimes Ἀντιμετάστασις.

Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the Divinity of Christ were passible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence and omnipresence; but because the same God the Son was also the Son of Man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal: mortal, as the Son of Man, in respect of his humanity; eternal, as the Son of God, in respect of his Divinity. The sufferings therefore of the Messias were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the human nature was conjoined to the Divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the Divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God; yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God, is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions, Who it was that suffered; in respect of his office, the Messias; in respect of his person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, 189
but in his humanity, which he assumed, clothed with our infirmities.

Our next inquiry is, What this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this Article; which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not governor of Judæa long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking then upon the sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the Gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And being we have already shewed his passion was wholly subjected in his human nature, being that nature consisteth of two parts, the soul and body; it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

For the first, As we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part: so we acknow-

ledge that he took a true and real body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ, really and truly human, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal body: and though now the same body, exalted above the highest heavens, by virtue of its glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it only liable to those internal weaknesses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connatural to the parts of our body, so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense, and grievous was that pain, which those scourges produced, *when the ploughers ploughed upon his back and made long their furrows:* the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary thorns did not only express the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which opened his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead: but the nails which pierced his hands and feet made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the body of the Son of Man truly *suffer* the bitterness of corporal pains and torments inflicted by violent external impressions. Ps.cxxix.3.

And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he *suffered* in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal passion[60]. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompense of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness,

60 'Quia suscepit animam, suscepit et animæ passiones.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib.* ii. *cap.* 3. [§ 56. vol. ii. p. 480 F.]

sorrow, and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented
Isa. liii. 3. to us by the Prophet, as *a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;* and the proper subject of that grief he hath fully ex-
Matt. xxvi. 38. pressed who alone felt it, saying unto his disciples, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.*

We ought not therefore to question whether he suffered in his 190
soul or no; but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffered; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure; yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God, and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The Evangelists have in such language expressed his agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration at the bitterness
Matt. xxvi. 37. of that passion. *He began to be sorrowful,* saith St. Matthew;
Mark xiv. 33. *He began to be sore amazed,* saith St. Mark, *and to be very heavy,* say both: and yet these words in our translation come far short of the original expression[61], which render him suddenly, upon a

61 The words in the original are three, λυπεῖσθαι, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, and ἀδημονεῖν. Λυπεῖσθαι, the first, is of a known and ordinary signification, but in this case it is to be raised to the highest degree of its possible significancy, as appears by the words which follow, Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου. For, as the ancient grammarians observe, Ἡ περὶ πρόθεσις ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ· and again, Ἡ περὶ πρόθεσις λαμβάνεται ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ κατὰ λόγον ὑπερθέσεως καὶ περιττότητος, and therefore περίλυπος of itself must signify a man possessed with an excessive grief; as in Æschylus, [Eum. 161] περίβαρυ κρύος, that is, according to the Scholiast, περισσῶς βαρύ. But beside this Greek notation, here is to be observed a reference to the words of David, Psal. xlii. 5. Ἱνατί περίλυπος εἶ, ἡ ψυχή μου; מה־תשתוחחי. So that it doth not only signify an excess of sorrow surrounding and encompassing the soul; but also such as brings a consternation and dejection of mind, bowing the soul under the pressure and burden of it. And if neither the notation of the word, nor the relation to that place in the Psalms did express that sorrow, yet the following part of our Saviour's words would sufficiently evidence it, ἕως θανάτου, it was a sorrow which like *the pangs of death compassed* him, and like *the pains of hell got hold upon* him. Psal. cxvi. 3. The second word, used by St. Mark alone, is ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, which with the Vulgar Latin is *pavere*, but in the language of the Greeks bears a higher sense. Θάμβος σημαίνει τὴν ἔκπληξιν, says Etymologus: and Hesychius, Θάμβος, θαῦμα, ἔκπληξις. *Gloss. Vet.* Θάμβος, *stupor.* Philoponus, preserved by Eustathius Ἰλ. μ'. [310] Θάμβος μὲν ἡ ἔκπληξις· θαμβὸς δὲ κατ' ὀξεῖαν τάσιν ὁ ἐκπλαγείς. From hence the verb θαμβεῖν, in termination active, in signification passive, *perculsum esse,* in Homer, Ἰλ. α'. 199. Θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεύς· where it is the observation of Eustathius, Τὸ ἐθάμβησεν ἐνεργητικὸν ἡ νεωτέρα χρῆσις οὐκ ἔχει· θαμβούμενοι γὰρ καὶ ἐθαμβήθη καὶ τεθάμβηται φασὶν οἱ μεθ' Ὅμηρον· but not universally true. For (as to our purpose) we have

present and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement, encompassed with grief, and overwhelmed with sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.

This he first expressed to his disciples, saying, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful;* and lest they should not fully apprehend the excess, adding, *even unto death,* as if the pangs of death had already encompassed him, and, as the Psalmist speaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He *went* but *a little farther* before he expressed the same to his Father, falling on his face and praying, even *with strong crying and tears, unto him that was* Heb. v. 7. *able to save him from death.* Nor were his cries or tears sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his
191 breast be poured forth either at his lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively

both the use and sense of this word in the Old Testament. As 1 Sam. xiv. 15. ותרגז הארץ καὶ ἐθάμβησεν ἡ γῆ, *and the earth quaked.* And Psal. xlviii. 5. חמהו, Aquila, ἐθαμβήθησαν, Symmachus, ἐξεπλάγησαν, as Psal. xxxi. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου, Aquila, θαμβήσει, Symmachus, ἐκπλήξει. The like is also in the passive termination: as Daniel expresses his fear in a vision, Ἐθαμβήθην, καὶ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου, Dan. viii. 17. and the wicked are described by the Wise Man, Θαμβούμενοι δεινῶς, καὶ ἐνδάλμασιν ἐκταρασσόμενοι, Sap. xvii. 3. From whence it appeareth that θαμβεῖσθαι of itself signifieth a high degree of fear, horror, and amazement. Θαμβοῦμαι, *Obstupeo, stupeo, pavesco. Gloss. Vet.* And by the addition of the preposition ἐξ the signification is augmented. Ἔκθαμβος, ἔκπληκτος, *Hesych.* passively; Θηρίον—φοβερὸν καὶ ἔκθαμβον, Dan. vii. 7. actively, i. e. ἐκπληκτικόν. Such an augmentation in this word is justifiable by that rule left us in Eustathius *ad* Ἰλ. ε'. [v. 142]. Ἡ ἐξ πρόθεσις οὐ μόνον τὴν ἔξω δηλοῖ σχέσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕψωμα πολλάκις σημαίνει. Of which he gives an example in ἐκνομίως, used by Aristophanes *in Pluto,* though not named by him. And again, *ad* Ἰλ. ν', [v. 278.] Ἡ ἐξ πρόθεσις ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ, ὁποίαν καὶ τὸ μάλιστα. Ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι therefore is μάλιστα θαμβεῖσθαι, to be surprised with horror in the highest degree, even unto stupefaction. Ἐκθαμβοῦμαι, *obstupesco, Gloss. Vet.* The third word is ἀδημονεῖν, *Vulg. Lat. tædere,* in St. Mark; *mœstus esse* in St. Matthew: but it hath yet a farther sense. Ἀδημονῶ, ἀκηδιῶ, ἀγωνιῶ, says Hesychius; Ἀδημονῶ, τὸ λίαν λυποῦμαι. *Suid.* It signifieth therefore grief and anguish in excess; as appeareth also by the origination of it. For, as Eustathius observes, Τοῦ ἀδημονεῖν πρωτότυπον ἀδήμων ἀδήμονος, ὁ ἐκ λύπης ὡς οἷα καί τινος κόρου, ὃς ἄδος λέγεται, ἀναπεπτωκώς. Ἰλ. λ'. [v. 88.] From ἄδω, ἀδήσω, ἀδήμων, from ἀδήμων, ἀδημονῶ. It hath therefore in it the signification of ἄδην, or λίαν, *satiety,* or *extremity.* From whence it is ordinarily so expounded, as if it contained the consequence of the greatest fear or sorrow, that is, anxiety of mind, disquietude, and restlessness. Ἀδημονεῖν, ἀλύειν καὶ ἀπορεῖν, ἀμηχανεῖν, *Etymol.* As Antony is expressed by Plutarch, after the loss of eight-thousand men, being in want of all things necessary for the rest, Κλεοπάτραν περιέμενε, καὶ βραδυνούσης ἀδημονεῖν ἤρξε. *Vit. Anton. cap.* 51. [p. 939 E.] So where the Heb. תשומם is by the LXX. translated ἐκπλαγῆς, by Symmachus it is rendered ἀδημονῆς, Eccles. vii. 16.

representations of the bitter anguish of his soul: and therefore
Luke xxii. 44. while he *prayed more earnestly*, in that agony *his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.* As the
Ps. xxii. 14. Psalmist had before declared; *I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels.* The heart of our Saviour was as it were melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body at the same time inflamed with anguish and agony; well then might that melting produce a sweat, and that inflamed and rarefied blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

And as the Evangelist's expressions, so the occasion of the grief, will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God
Isa. liii. 6. *laid on* his own Son *the iniquities of us all;* and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was he grieved for the sins of us all. If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge; he understood all the sins of men for which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the Majesty, and ingratitude against the goodness of God, which was contained in all those sins. If we look upon his absolute conformity to the will of God; he was inflamed with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and most studious to preserve that right which was so highly violated by those sins. If we look upon his relation to the sons of men; he loved them all far more than they did themselves, he knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternal destruction on their souls and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those graces which were without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with the greatest habitual detestation to abhor all sin; if we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law only for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?

Add unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once an heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any

of the saints of God; that he, being *touched with the feeling of* Heb. iv. 15. *our infirmities*, might become *a merciful High Priest, able* and ii. 17, 18. willing *to succour them that are tempted*. Thus may we *behold* Lam. i. 12. *and see if there be any sorrow like unto* that *sorrow which* was *done unto* him, *wherewith the Lord afflicted* him *in the day of his fierce anger*. And from hence we may and must conclude, that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoever he took: in his body, by internal infirmities and external injuries; in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shews us fully (if it can be shewn) the third particular propounded, What our Saviour suffered.

That our Saviour did thus *suffer*, is most necessary to believe. First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his human nature. For if he were not man, then could not man be redeemed by him; and if that nature in which he appeared were not truly human, then could he not be truly man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation. When therefore we see our Saviour truly
192 suffer, we know his Divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his human nature, as the proper subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, surely that Mediator between God and man was truly man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified died.

Secondly, It was necessary Christ should suffer for the redemption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation unto God; which was not otherwise to be performed than by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He therefore was by all his sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins. For salvation is impossible unto sinners without remission of sin; and remission, in the decree of God, is impossible without effusion of blood. Our redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a Lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

Thirdly, It behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternal happiness in the heavens both for himself the

Ps. cx. 7. Head, and for the members of his body. *He drunk of the brook*
Luke xxiv. *in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head. Ought not Christ*
26. *to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory?* And doth he not, by the same right by which he entered into it, confer that glory upon us? The recompense of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he cheerfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly, It was necessary Christ should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy: for this purpose was he made a sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High Priest: and therefore was he most unmerciful to himself, that he might be most merciful unto us.

Fifthly, It was necessary the Son of Man should suffer, thereby to shew us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are
Luke xxiii. to suffer. For *if these things* were *done to the green tree, what*
31. *shall be done to the dry?* Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternal, his only-begotten Son; how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastised, and appear to be in his paternal affection because they lie under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs, only because co-heirs with Christ; and we shall be kings, only because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, *If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise;* and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, If Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer. And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the direction in, our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the Article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to profess, when he makes this confession of his faith, *He suffered.* For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really persuaded within myself, and do make a sincere profession of this

as a most necessary, certain, and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind
193 really and truly suffer; not in his divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the days of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: that as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from human frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by external injuries; in his soul, by fearful apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour *suffered*.

Under Pontius Pilate.

AFTER the substance of this part of the Article, consisting in our Saviour's passion, *He suffered*, followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present governor, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which though the name of a stranger to the commonwealth of Israel and the Church of Christ, is well preserved to eternal memory in the sacred articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time, so it concerns the Church to be assured of the time in which he died. And because the ancient custom of the world was to make their computations by their governors, and refer their historical relations to the respective times of their government; therefore, that we might be properly assured of the actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings, (that is, the actions which others did to him,) the present governor is named in that form of speech which is proper to such historical or chronological narrations, when we affirm that he suffered *under Pontius Pilate*[62].

62 Ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Which words are capable of a double construction. First, as they are used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13. Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, *Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession*: that is, standing before him as before a judge. As of the same person, Matt. xxviii. 14. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, *If this come to be tried before the procurator*. Thus Festus propounded it to St. Paul, Acts xxv. 9. Θέλεις—κρίνεσθαι ἐπ' ἐμοῦ; and St. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος ἑστώς εἰμι. Thus Christ tells his Apostles, Mark xiii. 9. Ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε. And in this sense ἐπί is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, ἐπὶ Πιλάτου is *under Pilate*, that is, in the time of his government, when and while he was procurator of Judæa: as ἐπ' ἀρχιερέων Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα, Luke iii. 2. and ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. Mark ii. 26. Which is also according to the custom and language of the

And because he not only suffered under him as the present governor, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a judge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth, of our Saviour's sufferings, to declare what hath been left and derived to our knowledge, both concerning his person and his office.

For the first, we find him described by two names: nor is any other name of his extant, although according to the general custom of the Romans[63], he should have three. The first of 194
these two is *Pontius*[64], the name descending to him from the

Greeks: as Κατακλυσμὸς ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο. *Marm. Arundel.* Οὗτοι ἦσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαομέδοντος ἐξαναστάντων Τρώων. *Platon. Epist. ad Archytam;* [Ep. xii. p. 359 D.] and ἐπὶ τούτου βασιλεύοντος, *in this king's reign*, is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their nine Ἄρχοντες had one who was called Ἐπώνυμος, because his name was used for the denotation of that year; and the phrase was usually, ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα, or ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα ἄρχοντος, as I find it thrice together in one place. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Ἰσοκράτης) ἐπὶ Λυσιμάχου, Πλάτων δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀμεινίου γέγονεν, ἐφ' οὗ Περικλῆς ἐτελεύτησεν. *Diog. Laert. in Platone.* [l. iii. §. 3.] In the same manner did the Lacedæmonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the priestesses of Juno: Ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πεντήκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης. καὶ Αἰνησίου ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτῃ, καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἔτι δύο μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις. *Thucyd. lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. And as the Greeks thus referred all actions to the times of these governors, so did the Jews under the Roman government to the procurators of Judæa: as appeareth by Josephus, who, mentioning the first of that office, Coponius, presently relates the insurrection of Judas Galilæus in this manner: Ἐπὶ τούτου (Κωπωνίου) τὶς ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαίας, Ἰούδας ὄνομα, εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνῆγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους· *De Bell. Jud. lib.* ii. *cap.* 12. then names his successor Ambivius, ἐφ' οὗ Σαλώμη Ἰαμνιὰν καταλείπει· after him Rufus, ἐφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ τελευτᾷ Καῖσαρ. *Antiq. Jud. lib.* xviii. *cap.* 3. And in the same manner in the Creed, παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, our Saviour *suffered under Pontius Pilate:* that is, at the time when he was procurator of Judæa; as Ignatius fully, ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου. *Epist. ad Magnesios.* [§. 11. p. 20.]

63 Pausanias speaking of the Romans, saith, Τρία ὁπότε ἢ ὀλίγιστα, καὶ ἔτι πλέονα ὀνόματα ἑκάστῳ τίθενται. *Achaic. cap.* 7. And although Diomedes and Plutarch have observed, that even among the Romans there were some διώνυμα, yet the prænomen was never omitted, as Priscian affirmed; 'Ex illo tempore consuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absque prænomine.' *Lib.* ii.

64 *Pontius* and *Pilatus* were his nomen and cognomen, in the same manner as *Julius* and *Cæsar* are described by Suetonius: 'Non Cæsare et Bibulo, sed Julio et Cæsare, Coss. actum scriberent, bis eundem præponentes, nomine atque cognomine.' *Lib.* i. *cap.* 20. Thus, without a prænomen or agnomen, he is only known to us by his nomen properly called, and his cognomen. The nature of which two is thus described by the ancients: 'Nomen proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod originem gentis vel familiæ declarat, ut Portius, Cornelius; cognomen est quod uniuscujusque proprium, et nominibus gentilitiis subjungitur, ut Cato, Scipio.' *Diom. de Orat. lib.* i. p. 306. 'Nomen, quod familiæ originem declarat, ut Cornelius; cognomen, quod nomini subjungitur, ut Scipio.' *Charis. lib.* ii. The first of these Dionysius calls τὸ συγγενικὸν καὶ πατρωνυμικόν, Plutarch, οἰκίας ἢ γένους κοινόν, and κοινὸν ἀπὸ συγγενείας· the second he calls προσηγορικὸν ἐξ ἐπιθέτου. Thus *Pontius* was his nomen gentis or gentilitium, and *Pilatus* his cognomen. As therefore Pon-

original of his family, which was very ancient; the second *Pilatus*, as a cognominal addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same original.

He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the Equestrian order, sent by Tiberius the emperor to be a governor in Judæa. For about threescore years before our Saviour's birth, the Jews by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hyrcanus the high priest, the reign of Herod, and his son Archelaus, the Roman state suffered the Jews to be ruled by their own laws and governors; yet when Archelaus was banished by Augustus, they received their governors from the Roman emperor, being made a part of the province of Syria[65], belonging to his care. In the life of Augustus there was a succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gratus, and at his departure by Pontius Pilate.

The office which this Pilate bare was the procuratorship of Judæa, as is most evident out of the history both of the Romans[66], from whom he received his authority, and of the Jews,

tius Aquila, Pontius Cominius, Pontius Herennius, Pontius Paulinus, &c. so also Pontius Pilatus. Wherefore in vain have some of the ancients endeavoured to give an etymology of these names, as they do of Greek and Hebrew names in the Scripture, and think thereby to express the nature or actions of them that bare the names. As Isidorus Hispalensis, *Orig. lib.* vii. *cap.* 10. [p. 62 F.] 'Pontius, *declinans consilium*, utique Judæorum: accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, *Innocens ego sum a sanguine hujus justi.*' And Eutychius patriarch of Alexandria deduced *Pontius* from an island called Ponta, near to Rome. And St. Jerom, 'Quod significat nomen Pilati, i. e. *Malleatoris*, i. e. qui domat ferreas gentes, *ad Mat.* xv. Pilatus, *Os malleatoris*; quia dum Christum ore suo et justificat et condemnat, more malleatoris utrinque ferit.' *Isidor. ibid.* 'Pontius, *declinans consilium*; Pilatus, *Os malleatoris.*' *S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebraicis, in Luca, et rursus in Actis.* [vol. iii. p. 96.] Where he lets us understand that these etymologies were made from the Hebrew language; and makes an excuse, because the letter P is here taken for the Hebrew פ, to which the Latin F more properly answers. 'Sed sciendum est quod apud Hebræos P litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum sonet: abusive igitur accipienda, quasi per F literam scripta sint.' Thus did they vainly strive to find an Hebrew original, and that such an one as should represent the conditions of Pilate; when these two names are nothing else but the Roman nomen and cognomen of that person.

65 Τῆς Ἀρχελάου ἐθναρχίας μεταπεσούσης εἰς ἐπαρχίαν. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib.* ii. *cap.* 13. Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνεμηθείσης τῇ Σύρων. *Antiq. Jud. lib.* xvii. *cap.* 15. Παρῆν δὲ Κυρήνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίην προσθήκην Συρίας γινομένην. *Ibid. lib.* xviii. *cap.* 1.

66 Tacitus speaking of the Christians, 'Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est;' *Annal. lib.* xv. *cap.* 44. and Tertullian, most skilful of their laws and customs, speaks thus of our Saviour; 'Postremo oblatum Pontio Pilato, Syriam tunc ex

over whom he exercised his dominion. But what was the office of a procurator in those times[67], though necessary for our pre- 195

parte Romana procuranti:' *Apol. cap.* 21..[p. 20 C.] Whom St. Cyprian follows: 'Hunc Magistri eorum—Pontio Pilato, qui tunc ex parte Romana Syriam procurabat, tradiderunt:' *De Idol. Van.* [p. 228.] Thus also Josephus for the Jews: Πεμφθεὶς δὲ εἰς Ἰουδαίαν ἐπίτροπος ὑπὸ Τιβερίου Πιλάτος. *De Bell. Jud. lib.* ii. *cap.* 14. and Philo, Πιλάτος ἦν τῶν ὑπάρχων ἐπίτροπος ἀποδεδειγμένος τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *De Legat. ad Caium.* And therefore those words of St. Luke, iii. 1. ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, were properly translated by the old Interpreter, *procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam.* Thus Lucius Dexter *ad annum Christi* 28. 'Pontius Pilatus procurator Judææ a Tiberio mittitur in Judæam:' and Justin Martyr most properly; τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου· *Apol.* i. §. 13. [p. 51 B.] and again, speaking to the emperors by whom the procurators were sent, καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου· §. 40. [p. 67 D.] and again, κατὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 30. [p. 128 A.] As also Eusebius, Δωδεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας, ἐπίτροπος τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ Τιβερίου καθίσταται Πιλάτος. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 9. [p. 30.] and St. Jerom's translation of his Chronicon; 'Pilatus procurator Judææ a Tiberio mittitur.' Thus it appears that Pilate of the equestrian order was properly procurator, as that office was ordinarily given to men of that order, as Tacitus testifies; 'Cn. Julius Agricola utrumque avum procuratorem Cæsarum habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est;' *in Vit. Jul. Agr. cap.* 4. which is to be understood concerning the imperial provinces; for into those which were of the provinces of the people, the procurators sent by Cæsar were of the Liberti. For the emperor sent into all the provinces his procurators, but with this difference, as Dio observes; Εἰς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη, τά τε ἑαυτοῦ δὴ καὶ τὰ τοῦ δήμου, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἱππέων, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων, πέμπει. *Hist. lib.* liii. *c.* 15.

67 The Roman procurator is ordinarily in Greek authors expressed by their Ἐπίτροπος, as the Glossa Latino-Græca, Procurator, Ἐπίτροπος. But yet they are not of the same latitude in their use; Ἐπίτροπος comprehending the notion of tutor, as well as procurator. Ἐπίτροπος, ὁ προστατῶν χωρίων, καὶ ὅλης τῆς οὐσίας, καὶ ὀρφανῶν. *Hesych.* Ἐπίτροπος, *procurator, tutor. Gloss. Vet.* Ἐπίτροπος therefore was used by the Greeks in both notions, whereof *procurator* of the Latins is but one: and in the language of the Romans he is a *procurator,* which undertakes to manage the business of another man. 'Procurator si negotium suscipit,' saith Asconius in *Divinat.* and Sex. Pompeius, *lib.* iii. 'Procurator absentis nomine actor fit;' he to whom the care of another man's estate or affairs was committed. Ἐντολή, *commissum,* et Ἐντολεύς, *procurator. Gloss. Vet.* In correspondence to these procurators of the affairs and estates of private persons, there were made such as did take care in every province of the imperial revenue; who, in respect of the person whom they served, were called *Procuratores Cæsaris,* or *Augustales;* in respect of the countries where they served, were termed *procuratores provinciales.* Their office is best described by Dion, *Hist. lib.* liii. *c.* 15. Τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους, οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς τάς τε κοινὰς προσόδους ἐκλέγοντας, καὶ προστεταγμένα σφίσιν ἀναλίσκοντας, ὀνομάζομεν. We call, says he, these Ἐπιτρόπους, that is, *procuratores,* which receive the public revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the emperor. For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the emperor himself. 'Quæ acta gesta sunt a procuratore Cæsaris, sic ab eo comprobari ac si a Cæsare gesta essent.' *Ulpian. lib.* i. *ff.* As we read in Tacitus of the emperor Claudius; 'Sæpius audita vox principis, parem vim rerum habendam a procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si

sent purpose, is not so easy to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman government. For before the dominion of that city was changed from a commonwealth into an empire, there was no such public office in any of the provinces, and particularly in Judæa none till after the banishment of Archelaus, some years after our Saviour's birth. When Augustus divided the provinces of the empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care, and left the other to the inspection of the senate, he sent, together with the president of each province, as the governor in chief of the province, a procurator, whose office was, to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever else was due to the emperor, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their jurisdiction, but such a care and disposal of the imperial revenue: which they exercised as inferior and subordinate to the president, always supreme provincial officer.

Now Judæa being made a part of the province of Syria, and consequently under the care of the president of that province, according to this institution, a particular procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the emperor's revenue. And because the nation of the Jews were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Roman state, and the president of Syria, who had the power of the sword, was forced to attend upon the other parts of his province; therefore the procurator of Judæa was furnished with power of life and death[68], and so administered all the power of the president,

ipse statuisset;' *Annal. lib.* xii. *cap.* 60. and in Suetonius; 'Ut rata essent quæ procuratores sui in judicando statuerent, precario exegit.' *Lib.* v. *cap.* 12. [Claud. 12.] The proper office therefore of the provincial procurator was, to receive the imperial revenue, and dispose of it as the emperor commanded, and to all intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereunto, with such authority as if the emperor himself had done them.

68 This appeareth by Coponius, the first proper procurator of Judæa, who was brought in by Quirinus Præses of Syria, when he came to dispose of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce Judæa into the form of a province, and adjoin it to Syria. Of this Coponius Josephus writeth after this manner; Κωπώνιός τε αὐτῷ (Κυρηνίῳ) συγκατα-πέμπεται τάγματος τῶν ἱππέων ἡγησόμε-νος Ἰουδαίων τῆ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ, *that being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with Quirinus to govern the Jews with the supreme power; Antiq. Jud. lib.* xviii. *cap.* 1. and yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of his power: Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης, ἐπίτροπός τις ἱππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως, Κωπώνιος πέμπεται, μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν. *Idem, De Bell. Jud. lib.* ii. *cap.* 11. [c. 8. §. 1.] When those parts which were under the command of Archelaus were reduced into a

which was, as to the Jews, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the providence of God, by which the full power of judicature in Judæa was left in the hands of the resident procurator.

For by this means it came to pass that Christ, who by the determinate counsel of God was to die, and by the prediction of the Prophets was to suffer in a manner not prescribed by the Law of Moses, should be delivered up to a foreign power, and so suffer death after the customs of that nation to whose power he was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jew was high to accuse and prosecute him, but the power of the Jews was not so high as judicially to condemn him. For although the chief priests and the elders and the scribes *condemned him to be guilty of death;* yet they could not condemn him to die, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, but *delivered him up unto Pilate:* and when he refusing said unto them, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your Law,* they immediately returned, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.* The power of life and death was

196

Mark xiv. 64.

Mark xv. 1.

John xviii. 31.

province, Coponius was sent thither by the emperor, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the proconsular provinces the procurator of the emperor had no power but in those things which belonged to the exchequer, yet in those provinces which were properly *præsidales,* the procurator was often *loco præsidis.* From whence, in the ancient inscriptions, we read of the same person, 'procurator et præses Alpium,' 'procurator et præses provinciarum per orientem,' 'procurator et præses provinciæ Sardiniæ.' It was often therefore so, that the procurator did 'præsidis partibus fungi:' as Ulpian; 'In provinciam enim præsidum provinciarum, nec aliter procuratori Cæsaris hæc cognitio injungitur quam præsidis partibus in provincia fungatur.' *Lib.* viii. *de officio Proconsulis.* And this is very necessary to be observed, because a procurator barely such, not armed with the power of the præses provinciæ, had not the power of the sword. As Antoninus to Valerius; 'Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis non fungebatur, exilii tibi pœnam non potuit irrogare.' *Lib.* ix. *Cod. de pœnis:* and to Heliodorus; 'Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis provinciæ non fungitur, sicut exigere pœnam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita judicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua non potest.' *Lib.* iii. *C. Ubi causæ.* This was plain in the case of Lucilius Capito, procurator of Asia Minor, who was called in question for exceeding his power, and deserted therein by Tiberius. 'Procurator Asiæ Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam dixit, magna cum adseveratione principis non se jus nisi in servitia et pecunias familiares dedisse: quod si vim prætoris usurpasset, manibusque militum usus foret, spreta in eo mandata sua: audirent socios.' *Tacit. Annal. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. and Dion upon the said example observes in general, that the procurators had no such power: Οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν τότε τοῖς τὰ αὐτοκρατορικὰ χρήματα διοικοῦσι πλέον οὐδὲν ποιεῖν, ἢ τὰς νενομισμένας προσόδους ἐκλέγειν, καὶ περὶ τῶν διαφορῶν ἔν τε τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς ἰδιώταις δικάζεσθαι. *Hist. lib.* lvii. *cap.* 23. But although the ordinary procurators had no other power but to dispose of the revenue, and determine private causes; yet he which was *vice præsidis* had the power of the præses: and such a procurator was Pontius Pilate in Judæa, as the others who preceded him also were.

not in any court of the Jews, but in the Roman governor alone as supreme; and therefore[69] they answered him, it was *not lawful:* not in respect of the Law of Moses, which gave them both sufficient power and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death; but in relation to the Roman empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is sufficient to shew that they had it not when our Saviour suffered: and it is as true that they lost it twenty years before, at the relegation of Archelaus, and the coming of Coponius the procurator with full power of life and death. Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto Pilate as the supreme judge over the nation of the Jews, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon him.

But how this judge could be persuaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety, is not yet easy to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the Jews did not concern the Roman governors, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrels arising from the different sects. Pilate knew well it *was* Matt.xxvii. 18.
for envy that the chief priests *delivered him;* and when he had Luke xxiii. 14.
examined him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they *accused him.* Three times did he challenge the whole nation Verse 22.
of the Jews, *Why? what evil hath he done?* Three times did he make that clear profession, *I have found no cause of death in him.* Matt.xxvii. 19.
His own wife, admonished in a dream, *sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man:* and when he heard that he *made himself the Son of God, he was more afraid:* and John xix. 7, 8.
yet, notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he condemned and crucified him.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of Pilate,

69 I say *therefore* the Jews answered that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, because that power was taken out of their hands. For although St. Augustin think they thought it not lawful in respect of the passover, 'Intelligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diei festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam cœperant.' *Tract.* 14. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 789 F.] and St. Cyril be of the same opinion; yet others of the ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate to be their want of power, as Ammonius most expressly; Τίνος ἕνεκεν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀνεῖλον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον ἤγαγον; μάλιστα μὲν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑπετέμνετο, λοιπὸν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους τῶν πραγμάτων κειμένων· and upon those words in St. John, Ὡς ἐκπεσόντες τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἦσαν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους, εἶπον τοῦτο. So Theophylact, Ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον, οὐ γὰρ εἶχον αὐτοὶ ἐξουσίαν ἀνελεῖν, ἅτε τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους κειμένων. *Com. in Joan. cap.* 18. [p. 812 D.] and before him St. Chrysostom.

which inclined and betrayed him to so foul an act. He was a man of an high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit[70], as he is described by the Jews, and appeareth from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stampt with the pictures of Cæsar into Jerusalem (which was an abomination to the Jews), and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor persuaded by the most humble applications and submiss entreaties of the whole nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the emperor Tiberius. After that, he seized on the Corban, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an aquæduct: nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions, but his resolution went through their blood to bring in water. 197
When the Galileans came up to Jerusalem to worship God at
Luke xiii. 1. his own temple, *he mingled their blood with their sacrifices.* Add to this untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the Jews, an avaricious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them, and we may easily perceive what moved him to condemn that Person to death whom he declared innocent. The Evangelist telleth us
Mark xv. 15. that *Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus to be crucified.* They accused him at Rome for all the insolences and rapines[71] which he had committed, and by this act he thought to pacify them.

It was thus necessary to express the person under whom our Saviour suffered, first, that we might for ever be assured of the time[72] in which he suffered. The enemies of Christianity began

70 So Philo testifieth of him: Ἦν γὰρ τὴν φυσὶν ἀκαμπὴς, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐθάδους ἀμείλικτος. *De Legat. ad Caium.* [vol. ii. p. 590.] And again: Οἷα οὖν ἐγκότως ἔχων καὶ βαρύμηνις ἄνθρωπος.

71 For that which is observed by Philo upon the dedication of the shields at the first entrance into his government, must needs be much more true at this time of our Saviour's passion, when he had committed so many more insolences, viz. that he feared the Jews should complain of him to Tiberius. Τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἐξετράχυνε· καταδείσαντα μὴ τῷ ὄντι πρεσβευσάμενοι καὶ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτοῦ ἐπιτροπῆς ἐξελέγξωσι τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς ἁρπαγὰς, τὰς αἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τοὺς ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόνους, τὴν ἀνήνυτον καὶ ὀργαλεωτάτην ὠμότητα διεξελθόντες. *De Legat. ad Caium.* [p. 590.]

72 'Cautissime qui symbolum tradiderunt, etiam tempus, quo sub Pontio Pilato gesta sunt, designaverunt, ne ex aliqua parte velut vaga et incerta gestorum traditio vacillaret.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 18. p. ccxii.] 'Credimus itaque in eum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus. Addendum enim erat judicis nomen propter temporum cognitionem.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap.* 5. [§. 11. vol. vi. p. 156 E.] 'Pilatus judex erat in illo tempore ab Imperatore positus in Judæa, sub quo Dominus passus est; cujus mentio ad temporis significationem, non ad personæ illius

first to unsettle the time of his passion, that thereby they might at last deny the passion itself; and the rest of their falsehood was detected by the discovery of their false chronology[73]. Some fixed it to the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius[74]; whereas it is certain Pontius Pilate was not then procurator in Judæa; and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight years after, *in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.* Luke iii. 1. Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jerusalem might seem to follow upon, and for our Saviour's crucifixion, have removed it near threescore years more backward yet, placing his death in the beginning of Herod's reign[75], who was not born till toward the death of the same king. Others have removed it farther yet near twenty years[76], and so vainly tell us how he died under

pertinet dignitatem.' *Serm.* 131. *de Temp.** Irenæus speaking of St. Paul, 'Evangelizabat Filium Dei Christum Jesum, qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est:' *Lib.* v. *cap.* 12. [§. 5.] and to make the more certain character of time, Ignatius added to the name of Pilate that of Herod: Ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί. *Epist. ad Smyrn.* [§. 1. p. 34.]

73 So Eusebius detected some of those which lived not long before him: Οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀπελήλεγκται τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρώην διαδεδωκότων, ἐν οἷς πρῶτος αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς παρασημειώσεως χρόνος τῶν πεπλακότων ἀπελέγχει τὸ ψεῦδος. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 9. [p. 30.]

74 Ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης δ' οὖν ὑπατείας Τιβερίου, ἢ γέγονεν ἔτους ἑβδόμου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, τὰ περὶ τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῖς πάθος τολμηθέντα περιέχει· καθ' ὃν δείκνυται χρόνον, μηδ' ἐπιστάς πω τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ Πιλάτος. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. *cap.* 9. [p. 30.]

75 Divers of the Jews place the passion of Christ in the year of their account 3724, which is sixty-nine years before our common account of the year in which he truly suffered. This invention of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and backed with not so much as the least probability, they deliver as a tradition amongst them, continued in this rhythm,

בשנת ג'אלפים תש"כר הנצרי נלכד
ובשנת תק"לב נצלב:

i. e. *In the year* 3724 *he of Nazareth was taken,*
And in the year 532 *he was crucified on a tree.*

Not that they thought him taken in one year, and crucified in another; but these two unequal numbers signify the same year; the lesser number being a period of years, which seven times numbered equalleth the greater. So that their meaning is, that after seven periods consisting of 532 years, in the year of the world 3724, Jesus of Nazareth was crucified.

76 Others of the Jews pretend another account, viz. that Jesus was born in the year 3671, which was the fourth in the year of Jannæus, and crucified in the year 3707, which was the third of Aristobulus; making him the disciple of R. Josuah the son of Perachiah, according to that usual phrase of theirs, נרבי יהושע בן פרחיה שרחפו לישו בשתי ידים *Vide Sepher Juchasin.*†

* [This Sermon is rejected as spurious by the Benedictine editors. Append. ad vol. v. part ii. p. 398 A. Serm. ccxlii. 3.]

† [This computation may be found in the first edition of the Sepher Juchasin, Constant. 1566, f. 15 a. l. 15. In the second ed. Cracov. 1581, f. 16 b. antep. it is very much altered: thus for הנוצרי *the Nazaræan,* we have אותו האיש *that man,* and for הנוצרים *Christians* merely הם *they.*—R. P. S.]

Aristobulus, above fifty years before his birth in Bethlehem. This do they teach their proselytes, to this end, that they may not believe so much as the least historical part of the blessed Evangelists. As therefore they deny the time of our Saviour's passion, in design to destroy his doctrine; so, that we might establish the substance of the Gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should retain a perfect remembrance of the time in which he died. Nor need we be ashamed that the 198
Christian religion, which we profess, should have so known an epocha, and so late an original. Christ came not into the world
Gal. iv. 4. in the beginning of it, but in *the fulness of time.*

Secondly, it was thought necessary to include the name of Pilate in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerful external testimony[77] to the certainty of our Saviour's death, and the innocency of his life. He did not only profess, to the condemnation of the Jews, that he found nothing worthy of death in Christ; but left the same written to the Gentiles of the Roman empire. Two ways he is related to have given most ample testimony to the truth: first, by an express written to Tiberius[78], and by him presented to the senate; secondly, by records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government[79].

77 'Nota quod in Pilato et uxore ejus, justum Dominum confitentibus, Gentilis populi testimonium sit.' *S. Hieron. in Matt.* xxvii. [vol. vii. p. 229 C.]

78 That Pontius Pilate wrote unto Tiberius of the death and resurrection of our Saviour, is testified by Tertullian, who was best acquainted with the Roman history: 'Ea omnia supèr Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Cæsari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit.' *Apolog. cap.* 21. [p. 20 D.] And again; 'Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum intravit, annuntiata sibi ex Syria Palæstina, quæ illic veritatem istius (Christi) divinitatis revelarant, detulit ad Senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui.' *Ibid. cap.* 5. [p. 6 B.] This is related by Eusebius out of Tertullian in his Ecclesiastical History, *lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. and referred to the two and twentieth year of Tiberius in his Chronicon; 'Pilato de Christianorum dogmate ad Tiberium referente, Tiberius retulit ad Senatum, ut inter cætera sacra reciperetur.' The authority of this express is grounded on the great reputation of Tertullian (as is observed also by the author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum,* who concludes the relation with these words, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Τερτυλλιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος,) and the general custom by which all the governors of the provinces did give an account unto the emperor of all such passages as were most remarkable: Παλαιοῦ κεκρατηκότος ἔθους τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι, τὰ παρά σφισι καινοτομούμενα τῷ τὴν βασίλειον ἀρχὴν ἐπικρατοῦντι σημαίνειν, ὡς ἂν μηδὲν αὐτὸν διαδιδράσκοι τῶν γινομένων. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. [p. 46.]

79 The ancient Romans were very desirous to preserve the memory of all remarkable passages which happened in the city: and this was done either in their *Acta Senatus,* or *Acta diurna populi,* which were diligently made and carefully kept at Rome. In the same manner the governors in the provinces

Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the Roman governor in the expression of our Saviour's passion, that thereby we might understand how it came to pass that Christ should suffer according to the Scriptures. The Prophets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose law and custom no man amongst them ever so died. Being then so great a Prophet could not die but in Jerusalem, being the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the laws and customs of the Jews; it was necessary a Roman governor should condemn him, that so the counsel of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one, and the customs of the other.

And now the advantage of this circumstance is discovered, every one may express the importance of it in this manner. I am fully persuaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the *fulness of time* God sent his Son, and that the eternal Son of God so sent by him did suffer for the sins

took care that all things worthy of remark should be written in public tables, and preserved as the Acta in their government. And agreeably to this custom Pontius Pilate kept the memoirs of the Jewish affairs, which were therefore called *Acta Pilati*, in which an account was given of our blessed Saviour; and the primitive Christians did appeal unto them in their disputes with the Gentiles, as to a most undoubted testimony. Justin Martyr urged them even unto the Roman emperors: Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἄκτων· *Apol.* i. §. 35. [p. 65 D.] and again: Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἄκτων μαθεῖν δύνασθε. *Ibid.* §. 48. [p. 72 A.] And in the differences between the Christians, they were cited by both parties. As the *Tessaresdecatitæ* alleged them for their custom of the observance of Easter, as Epiphanius testifieth of them: Ἀπὸ τῶν Ἄκτων δῆθεν Πιλάτου αὐχοῦσι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν εὑρηκέναι, ἐν οἷς ἐμφέρεται, τῇ πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι· and Epiphanius urgeth the same Acta against them, but according to other copies: Ἔτι δὲ εὕρομεν ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν (lege Ἄκτων) Πιλάτου, ἐν οἷς σημαίνει πρὸ δεκαπέντε καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸ πάθος γεγενῆσθαι. *Hæres.* l. §. 1. [vol. i. p. 420.] Though the author of the eighth Homily *in Pascha*, under the name of St. Chrysostom, agreeth in this reading with the *Tessaresdecatitæ*: Ὁ μὲν χρόνος καθ' ὃν ἔπαθεν ὁ Σωτὴρ οὐκ ἠγνόηται· τὰ γὰρ ὑπομνήματα τὰ ὑπὸ Πιλάτου πραχθέντα καὶ τὴν προθεσμίαν περιέχει τοῦ Πάσχα· ἱστορεῖται γοῦν, ὅτι τῇ πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων ἔπαθεν ὁ Σωτήρ. [Hom. vii. in Pascha. §. 2. vol. viii. App. p. 277 D.] These were also mentioned in the *Acta S. Tarachi, Probi et Andronici, cap.* 9. 'Præses dixit, Inique, non scis, quem invocas, Christum, hominem quidem fuisse factum, sub custodia Pontii Pilati, et punitum, cujus exstant Acta passionis?' These Acta in the time of Maximinus were adulterated, and filled with many blasphemies against our Saviour; as appears by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 9. [p. 30.] Οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀπελήλεγκται τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρώην διαδεδωκότων· and *lib.* ix. *cap.* 5. [p. 443.] Πλασάμενοι δῆτα Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας· γνώμῃ τοῦ μείζονος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν διαπέμπονται τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχήν.

of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Roman emperor, and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate the Cæsarean procurator of Judæa; who, to please the nation of the Jews, did 199
condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custom of that empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death upon the cross. And thus I believe in Christ that *suffered under Pontius Pilate.*

Was crucified.

FROM the general consideration of our Saviour's passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his crucifixion, standing between his passion, which it concludeth, and his death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised Messias was to be crucified, that he which was designed to die for our sins, was to suffer upon the cross; secondly, to shew that our Jesus, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer, whatsoever was so foretold, upon the cross; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contained in dying on the cross.

That the Messias was to be crucified, appeareth both by types which did apparently foreshew it, and by prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For though all those representations and predictions which the forward zeal of some ancient Fathers[80]

[80] The ancient Fathers, following the steps of the Apostles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviour's death out of the Old Testament, have made use of those types and prophecies which did really and truly foreshew it; but, together with them, partly out of their own conceptions, partly out of too much credit to the translations, have urged those places which the Jews may most easily evade, and we can produce but with small or no pretence. As for the extending of the hands of Moses, they conceive it to be a perfect type; and Barnabas tells us, the Spirit commanded Moses that he should make the similitude of a cross; Λέγει εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Μωσῆ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τύπον σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν· *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 12. [p. 39.] but the text assures us no more than that Moses held up his hand, which might be without any similitude of a cross; and when both were lifted up by Aaron and Hur, the representation is not certain. And yet after Barnabas, Justin tells us that Moses represented the cross, τὰς χεῖρας ἑκατέρως ἐκπετάσας. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 90. [p. 188 A.] and Tertullian calls it 'habitum crucis.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 18. [p. 408 A.] In the same manner, with the strange Indian statue, which is described by Bardisanes as ἀνδριὰς ἑστὼς ὀρθὸς, ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ἡπλωμένας ἐν τύπῳ σταυροῦ. *Porphyr. de Styge.* With less probability did they gather both the name of Jesus, and the cross of Christ, from the 318 servants of Abraham. Ἰῶτα δέκα, Ἡτα ὀκτὼ, ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν· ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Τ, ἔμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν· λέγει καὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους· δηλοῖ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰη-

gathered out of the Law and the Prophets cannot be said to signify so much, yet in many types was the crucifixion of Christ represented, and by some prophecies foretold. This was the true and unremovable *stumblingblock to the Jews*, nor could they ever be brought to confess the Messias should die that death upon a tree to which the curse of the Law belonged[81]: and yet we need no other oracles than such as were committed to those Jews, to prove that Christ was to suffer. 1 Cor. i. 23.

A clearer type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed,

σοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ γράμμασι, καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ τὸν σταυρὸν. *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 9. [p. 29.] As if IH stood for Jesus, and T for the cross. And yet Clemens Alexandrinus follows him: Φασὶν οὖν εἶναι τοῦ μὲν κυριακοῦ σημείου τύπον κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τριακοσιοστὸν στοιχεῖον· τὸ δὲ Ἰῶτα καὶ τὸ Ἦτα τοὔνομα σημαίνειν τὸ σωτήριον. *Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 11. vol. ii. p. 782.] As also St. Ambrose; 'Nam et Abraham 318 duxit ad bellum, et ex innumeris trophæa hostibus reportavit, signoque Dominicæ crucis et nominis, &c.' *Prol. ad lib.* i. *de Fide.* [§. 3. vol. ii. p. 444 A.] 'Eos adscivit quos dignos numero fidelium judicavit, qui in Domini nostri Jesu Christi passionem crederent. Trecentos enim T Græca litera significat; decem et octo autem summum IH exprimit.' *Idem de Abrah. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [§. 15. vol. i. p. 287 E.] And St. Augustin of another 300: 'Quorum numerus, quia trecenti erant, signum insinuat crucis, propter literam T Græcam, qua iste numerus significatur.' *Quæst. in Heptat. lib* vii. *quæst.* 37. [vol. iii. part i. p. 605 G.] And Clemens Alexandrinus again of the 300 cubits in the Ark: Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τοὺς τριακοσίους πήχεις σύμβολον τοῦ κυριακοῦ σημείου λέγουσι. *Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 11. vol. ii. p. 783.] 'Sed sicut ille non multitudine nec virtute legionum, sed jam tum in sacramento crucis, cujus figura per literam Græcam T numero trecentorum exprimitur, adversarios principes debellavit: cujus mysterii virtute trecentis in longum texta cubitis superavit arca diluvium, ut nunc Ecclesia hoc seculum supernavigat.' *S. Paulinus Epist.* 2. [al. Ep. xxiv. p. 162 B.] As unlikely a type did they make Jacob's ladder: 'Et puto crucem Salvatoris istam esse scalam quam vidit Jacob.' *S. Hieron. Com. in Psal.* xci.* 'Scala usque ad cœlum attingens crucis figuram habuit; Dominus innixus scalæ, Christus crucifixus ostenditur.' *S. August. Serm. de Temp.* 79.† These, and many others, by the writers of the succeeding ages were produced out of the Old Testament as types of the cross, and may in some sense be applied to it being otherwise proved, but prove it not.

81 Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justin Martyr, when he had confessed many of the Christian doctrines, would by no means be brought to this; Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀτίμως οὕτως σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν (subaud. ἔδει) ἀποροῦμεν· ἐπικατάρατος γὰρ ὁ σταυρούμενος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λέγεται εἶναι· ὥστε πρὸς τοῦτο ἀκμὴν δυσπείστως ἔχω. §. 89. [p. 187 A.] And afterwards granting his passion, urgeth him to prove his crucifixion; Ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὐδ' εἰς ἔννοιαν τούτου ἐλθεῖν δυνάμεθα. *Ibid.* So Tertullian describes the Jews, 'Negantes passionem crucis in Christum prædicatam, et argumentantes insuper non esse credendum, ut ad id genus mortis exposuerit Deus Filium suum, quod ipse dixit, *Maledictus omnis homo qui pependit in ligno.*' *Adv. Jud. cap.* 10. [p. 195 A.]

* [This is not a work of Jerom. See Op. vol. vii. Append. p. 250.]

† [This Sermon is rejected by the Benedictine editor. Append. ad vol. v. part ii. p. 24. Serm. XI. 6.]

than Isaac was: nor can God the Father, who gave his only-begotten Son, be better expressed than by that Patriarch in his 200
Gen. xxii. 2. readiness to sacrifice his son, *his only son Isaac, whom he loved.* Now when that grand act of obedience was to be performed, we find Isaac walking to the mountain of Moriah with the wood
Gen. xxii. 7. on his shoulders, and saying, *Here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?* while in the command of God, and the intention and resolution of Abraham, Isaac is the sacrifice who bears the wood. And the Christ, who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blessed, could die no other death in which the wood was to be carried; and being to die upon the cross, was, by the formal custom[82] used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it. Therefore Isaac bearing the wood did presignify Christ bearing the cross[83].

When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and *much people*
Num. xxi. 9. *died*, Moses, by the command of God, *made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole: and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.* Now
Gen. iii. 15. if there were no expresser promise of the Messias than the *seed of the woman*, which should *bruise the serpent's head;* if he were to perform that promise by the virtue of his death; if no death could be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as that of crucifixion; then was that manifestly foretold which
John iii. 14. Christ himself informed Nicodemus, *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up*[84].

82 This custom is very considerable as to the explication of this type; and is to be therefore confirmed by the testimonies of the ancients, which are most express. Βαστάζειν τινὰ τῶν δαιμόνων χθονίων — κακούργῳ μὲν ἰδόντι σταυρὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνει· ἔοικε γάρ ὁ σταυρὸς θανάτῳ, καὶ ὁ μέλλων προσηλοῦσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει. *Artemid. Oneirocr. lib.* ii. *cap.* 61. Τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος τῶν κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρόν. *Plutarch. de his qui sero puniuntur.* [vol. ii. p. 554 A.] So these not long after our Saviour's death; and much before it, Plautus *in Carbonario*, [Fragm. ii. 445.]

Patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci.

83 This is not only the observation of the Christians, but the Jews themselves have referred this type unto that custom. For upon Gen. xxii. 6. *And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son*, the lesser *Bereshith* hath this note, כזה שמושן צלובו בכתפו *as a man carries his cross upon his shoulders.**

84 The common phrase by which that death was expressed. 'In crucem tolli:' *Paul. lib.* v. *Sentent. tit.* 22, 23, *et* 25. As in the Chaldee וקיסוה by origination *elevatio*, by use is particularly *crucifixio.*

* [Quoted from Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 663. The passage is however to be found in the Bereshith Rabba, Venice 1556, f. 116 a. and in the Jalkut, Livorno 1657, f. 62 b. ult.—R.P.S.]

The paschal lamb did plainly typify that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; and the preparing of it did not only represent the cross[85], but the command or ordinance of the passover did foretell as much. For while it is said, *Ye shall not break a bone thereof*, it was thereby intimated, that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones belonged (and that, according to the constant custom, was the punishment of crucifixion[86]), but only in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserved, as that not one bone of his should be touched. And thus the crucifixion of the Messias in several types was represented. Exod. xii. 46.

Nor was it only thus prefigured and involved in these typical resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the Prophets in their particular and express predictions. Nor shall we need the access-
201 sion of any lost or additional prophetical expressions, which some of the ancients have made use of[87]: those which are still

85 Justin Martyr shews how the manner of the roasting of the paschal lamb did represent the affixing of a man unto the cross, and thereby was a type of Christ. Τὸ κελευσθὲν πρόβατον ἐκεῖνο ὀπτὸν ὅλον γίνεσθαι, τοῦ πάθους τοῦ σταυροῦ δι' οὗ πάσχειν ἔμελλεν ὁ Χριστὸς, σύμβολον ἦν· τὸ γὰρ ὀπτώμενον πρόβατον σχηματιζόμενον ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀπτᾶται. Εἷς γὰρ ὄρθιος ὀβελίσκος διαπερονᾶται ἀπὸ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ εἷς πάλιν κατὰ τὸ μετάφρενον, ᾧ προσαρτῶνται καὶ αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ προβάτου. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 40. [p. 137 B.] To which Arnoldus Carnotensis alludeth: 'In veru crucis boni odoris assatio excoquat carnalium sensuum cruditatem.' *De Cœna Domini*, commonly attributed to St. Cyprian. Nor is this roasting of the lamb any far-fetched figure of the cross; for other roasting hath been thought a proper resemblance of it: where the body of the thing roasted hath limbs, as a lamb, there it bears the similitude of a proper cross, with an erect and transverse beam; where the roasted body is only of length and uniform, as a fish, there the resemblance is of a straight and simple σταυρός. As it is represented by Hesychius: Σκόλοψιν ὡς ὄπτησιν· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν τοὺς κακουργοῦντας ἀνεσκολόπιζον ὀξύνοντες ξύλον διὰ τῆς ῥάχεως καὶ τοῦ νώτου, καθάπερ τοὺς ὀπτωμένους ἰχθῦς ἐπὶ ὀβελίσκων.

86 Although indeed it must be confessed, that the crurifragium and the crucifixion were two several punishments, and that they ordinarily made the cross a lingering death; yet because the Law of Moses did not suffer the body of a man to hang upon a tree in the night, therefore the Romans, so far to comply with the Jews, did break the bones of those whom they crucified in Judæa constantly; whereas in other countries they did it but occasionally.

87 As Barnabas cites one of the Prophets whom we know not: 'Ομοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὁρίζει ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι, Καὶ πότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; καὶ λέγει Κύριος, Ὅταν ξύλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ, *Epist. cap.* 12. [p. 38.] which words are not to be found in any of the Prophets. Thus Justin Martyr, to prove ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι βασιλεύσει ὁ Χριστός, produceth a prophecy out of the 96th Psalm, in these words; Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 73. [p. 170 C.] and Tertullian, who advances all his conceptions, 'Age nunc, si legisti penes Prophetam in Psalmis, *Dominus regnavit a ligno;* exspecto quid intelligas, ne forte

preserved even among the Jews, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

When God foretells by the Prophet Zachary, what he should suffer from the sons of men, he says expressly[88], *They shall look*

Zech. xii. 10.

lignarium aliquem regem significari putetis, et non Christum, qui exinde a passione Christi (lege *crucis*, for he himself hath it *ligni*, *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 19. [p. 408 B.]) superata morte regnavit.' *Adv. Jud. cap.* 10. [p. 196 B.] and in the place cited against Marcion: 'Etsi enim mors ab Adam regnavit usque ad Christum, cur Christus non regnasse dicatur a ligno, ex quo crucis ligno mortuus, regnum mortis exclusit?' Thus they, and some after them, make use of those words, ἀπὸ ξύλου, *a ligno*, which are not to be found either in the Greek or Latin translation, from whence they seem to produce them; nor is there any thing like them in the original, or any translation extant, nor the least mention or footstep of them in the *Catena Græcorum Patrum*. Justin Martyr indeed accused the Jews for rasing the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου out of the text: Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνενηκοστοῦ πέμπτου ψαλμοῦ τῶν διὰ Δαβὶδ λεχθέντων λόγων, λέξεις βραχείας ἀφείλοντο ταύτας, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου· εἰρημένου γὰρ τοῦ λόγου, Εἴπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, ἀφῆκαν, Εἴπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν. *Ibid.* But first he doth not accuse them for rasing it out of the original Hebrew, for his discourse is only to shew that they abused the LXX. Secondly, though the Jews had rased it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have gotten it out of the Bibles in the Christians' hands, in which those words are not to be found.

88 These words of Zachary are clear in the original, והביטו אלי את אשר־דקרו although the LXX. have made another sense, Ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, by translating את אשר ἀνθ' ὧν, *eo quod;* as also the Chaldee Paraphrase על די with the Arabic version; and the Syriac another yet, by rendering it *per eum quem*, as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of את אשר is nothing else but *quem*, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent אלי, who, being the same with him who immediately before promiseth to pour upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not אלי, but אליו, not *on me*, but *on him*, to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic translations. Nor can the Rabbins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confess. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place, רזל׳ פירשוהו על משיח בן יוסף: *Our masters have expounded this of the Messias the son of Joseph.* That they interpreted it therefore of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was to be the son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that St. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in *Bereshith Rabba*, we are clearly taught thus much; for unto that question, *Who art thou, O great mountain?* Zech. iv. 7. he answereth, הר הגדול זה משיח בן דוד *The great mountain is the Messias the son of David.* And he proves it from, *Grace, grace unto it,* שהו נותן חן והתחנונים *because he giveth grace and supplications;* as it is written, Zech. xii. 10.*

* [Quoted from Martini Pugio Fidei, 330, 331, who repeatedly adduces these words from the Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxviii. 10. But Galatinus de Arcanis, l. iii. c. 21. says that it is from that Bereshith of which Moses Haddarshan is the reputed author. It is not to be found in the real Bereshith, but a somewhat similar passage may be seen in the Jalkut on the Prophets ילקוט נביאים on Zechariah, §. תקצא.—R.P.S.]

upon me whom they have pierced; and therefore shews that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of Man, and by our nature liable to vulneration; and withal foretells the piercing of his body: which being added to that prediction in the Psalms, *They pierced my hands and my feet*[89], clearly representeth and foretelleth to us the death upon the cross, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these prophecies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that Disciple whom our Saviour loved, and to whom he made a singular application even upon the cross; therefore the Jews have used more than ordinary industry and artifice to elude these two predictions, but in vain[90]. For these two Prophets, David and Zachary, manifestly did foretell the particular punishment of crucifixion. Ps. xxii. 16.

202 It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophecies, that the promised Messias was to be *crucified*. And it is as certain that our Jesus, the Christ whom we worship, and from whom we receive that honour to be named Christians, was really and truly *crucified*. It was first the wicked design of Judas, who *betrayed* him to Matt. xxvi. 2.

89 This translation indeed seems something different from the Hebrew text, as we now read it, כארי ידי ורגלי *Sicut leo, manus meas et pedes meos.* But it was not always read as now it is. For R. Jacob the son of Chajim, *in Massoreth magna* מערכת אות האלף *ordine* אר, [ad. calc. Bibl. Rabb. ed. 2a.] testifieth that he found בקצת ספרים מדוייקים *in some correct copies,* כתוב כארו *written in the text, but* קרי כארי *read, and therefore written in the margin.* The same is testified by the *Masorah* on Num. xxiv. 9. citing the words of this text, and adding כארו כתיב. And Johannes Isaac Levita confirmeth it by his own experience, who had seen in an ancient copy כארו in the text, and כארי in the margin. It was anciently therefore without question written כארו, as appeareth not only by the LXX., who translated it ὤρυξαν, *foderunt;* and Aquila, who rendered it ἤσχυναν, *fœdarunt,* (in the same sense with that of Virgil;

Obscœnas pelagi ferro fœdare volucres.
Æneid. iii. 241.

and the old Syriac, which translateth it בזעו *transfixerunt;* but also by the less, or marginal, *Masorah,* which noteth that the word כארי is found written alike in two places; this and Isaiah xxxviii. 13. but in divers significations: wherefore being in Isaiah it manifestly signifieth *sicut leo,* it must not signify the same in this; and being the Jews themselves pretend to nothing else, it followeth that it be still read as it was, כארו and translated *foderunt.* From whence it also appeareth, that this was one of the eighteen places which were altered by the Scribes.

90 For the *Masorah* in several places confesseth, that eighteen places in the Scriptures have been altered by the Scribes; and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but sixteen: the other two without question are those concerning the crucifixion of the Messias, Psal. xxii. 16. and Zech. xii. 10. For that of Zachary, a Jew confessed it to Mercerus; and that of David, we shewed before to be the other.

that death; it was the malicious cry of the obdurate Jews, John xix. 15. *Crucify him, crucify him.* He was actually condemned and Luke xxiii. 24. *delivered* to that death by Pilate, who *gave sentence that it should be as they required:* he was given into the hands of the soldiers, the instruments commonly used in inflicting Matt. xxvii 31. that punishment[91], who *led him away to crucify him.* He underwent those previous pains which customarily antecede that suffering, as flagellation[92], and bearing of the Verse 26. cross: for Pilate *when he had scourged Jesus, delivered him to* John xix. 17. *be crucified; and he bearing his cross went forth into Golgotha.* They carried him forth out of the city, as by custom in that kind of death they were wont to do[93]; and there between two malefactors, usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment[94], they *crucified him.* And that he was truly fastened to the cross, appears by the satisfaction given to doubting John xx. 25, 27. Thomas, who said, *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, I will not believe:* and our Saviour said unto him, *Reach hither thy finger,*

91 That the soldiers did execute the sentence of death given by the Roman magistrates in their provinces, and not only in the camp, is evident out of the historians of that nation.

92 'Sciendum est Romanis [Pilatum] legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum est, ut qui crucifigitur prius flagellis verberetur.' *S. Hieron. ad Matt.* xxvii. 26. [vol. vii. p. 230 E.] To which Lucian alludes in his own condemnation: Ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀνεσκολοπίσθαι δοκεῖ αὐτὸν, νὴ Δία, μαστιγωθέντα γε πρότερον. *Lucian. in Piscatore, cap.* 2. 'Multi occisi, multi capti, alios verberatos crucibus affixit.' *Liv. lib.* xxxiii. *cap.* 36. So Curtius reports of Alexander, 'Omnes verberibus affectos sub ipsis radicibus petræ crucibus jussit affigi.' *Lib.* vii. *cap.* 11. Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and crucified: Μαστιγούμενοι καὶ προβασανιζόμενοι τοῦ θανάτου πᾶσαν αἰκίαν, ἀνεσταυροῦντο. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib.* v. *cap.* 28. [c. 11.]

93 This was observed both by the Jews and Romans, that their capital punishments were inflicted without their cities: and that particularly was observed in the punishment of crucifixion. Plautus;

Credo ego isthoc exemplo tibi esse eundum actutum extra portam,
Dispessis manibus, patibulum cum habebis.——

Miles Glor. act. ii. sc. 4.

Tully; 'Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia.' *Lib.* v. *in Verr. cap.* 66.

94 Thieves and robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Cæsar used his pirates, Τοὺς λῃστὰς ἅπαντας ἀνεσταύρωσε. *Plutarch. in Vita, cap.* 2. 'Imperator provinciæ jussit latrones crucibus affigi.' *Petron. Satyr.* [c. cxi.] 'Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis.' *Apul. de Aur. Asin. lib.* iii. 'Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspendatur.' *Sen. Epist.* 7. Where suspendi is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latin authors which wrote before the days of Constantine. 'Famosos latrones, in his locis ubi grassati sunt, furca figendos compluribus placuit.' *Callis. lib.* xxxviii. *de pœnis.* Where *furca figendos* is put for *crucifigendos;* being so altered by Tribonianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law.

and behold my hands: whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that he was the Christ; and us, that the Christ was truly crucified; against that fond heresy[95], which made Simon the Cyrenean not only bear the cross, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore infer this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergo those sufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the cross.

Being thus fully assured that the Messias was to be, and that our Christ was truly, crucified; it, thirdly, concerns us to understand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularities of suffering which he endured on the cross. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was: for being a Roman punishment, it was continued in that empire while it remained heathen: but when the emperors themselves received Christianity, and the towering eagles resigned the flags unto the cross, this punish-
203 ment was forbidden by the supreme authority[96], out of a due respect and pious honour to the death of Christ. From whence it came to pass, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so

[95] This was the peculiar heresy of Basilides, a man so ancient, that he boasted to follow Glaucias as his master, who was the disciple of St. Peter. And Irenæus hath declared this particularity of his: 'Quapropter neque passum eum; sed Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo; et hunc secundum ignorantiam et errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Jesus; et ipsum autem Jesum Simonis accepisse formam, et stantem irrisisse eos;' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* i. *cap.* 23. [c. 24. §. 4. p. 101.] and Tertullian, of the same Basilides: 'Hunc (Christum) passum a Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nec in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidisse.' *De Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap.* 46. [p. 219 D.] From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxiv. §. 3. and by St. Augustin, *Hæres.* 4.

[96] This is observed by St. Austin, *Serm.* 18. *de Verbis Dom.* [c. ix. §. 8. vol. v. pt. i. p. 473 F.] 'Quia ipse honoraturus erat fideles suos in fine hujus seculi, prius honoravit crucem in hoc seculo; ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentium crucifigi:' and, *Tract.* 36. *in Joan.* [vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 546 A.] speaking of this particular punishment; 'Modo in pœnis reorum non est apud Romanos; ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum est quod et reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur.' Whence appears, first, that in the days of St. Austin crucifixion was disused; secondly, that it was prohibited by the secular princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he sheweth not. It is therefore to be observed, that it was first forbidden by the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great: of whom Sozomenus gives this relation; Ἀμέλει τοι πρότερον νενομισμένην Ῥωμαίοις τὴν τοῦ σταυροῦ τιμωρίαν νόμῳ ἀνεῖλε τῆς χρήσεως τῶν δικαστηρίων. *Lib.* i. *cap.* 8. [p. 20.].

frequently represent it to the Christian's eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that Christ was *crucified:* but being the most usual or original word[97] doth not

97 The original word in the New Testament, for the tree on which our Saviour suffered, is *σταυρός*, and the action or crucifixion *σταύρωσις*, the active *σταυροῦν*, and the passive *σταυροῦσθαι*. Now *σταυρός*, from which the rest mentioned are manifestly derived, hath of itself originally no other signification than of a *stake*. As we find it first used by Homer;

Σταυροὺς δ' ἐκτὸς ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,
Πυκνοὺς καὶ θαμέας, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς ἀμφικεάσσας. Ὀδ. ξ'. 11.
Ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ μεγάλην αὐλὴν ποίησαν ἄνακτι
Σταυροῖσιν πυκινοῖσι———— Ἰλ. ω'. 452.

These are the same which Homer elsewhere calls *σκόλοπες*, and the ancient grammarians render each by other. As Eustathius; Σταυροὶ δὲ ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀπωξυμμένα ξύλα.—οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ σκόλοπες λέγονται, ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι καὶ ἀνασταυροῦσθαι· so he, expounding *σταυρός*; and in the same manner expounding *σκόλοπες*· [Ἰλ. η'. 441.] Λέγονται δὲ οἱ τοιοῦται σκόλοπες καὶ σταυροί·—ἐκ δὲ τούτων τὸ ἀνασκολοπίζειν, καὶ ἀνασταυροῦν. As when Homer describes the Phæacian walls,

————Τείχεα μακρὰ,
Ὑψηλὰ σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα,——
Ὀδ. η'. 44.

he gives this exposition; Σκόλοπες δὲ καὶ νῦν ξύλα ὀρθὰ, οἱ καὶ σταυροί. In the same manner Hesychius; Σταυροὶ, οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοπες, χάρακες· and Σκόλοπες, ὀρθέα, (l. ὀρθὰ) καὶ ὀξέα ξύλα, σταυροὶ, χάρακες· and again, Χάραξι, φραγμοῖς, ὀξέσι ξύλοις· οἱ δὲ, καλάμοις, οἱ δὲ, σταυροῖς. Besides they all agree in the same etymology, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵστασθαι, and therefore always take it for a straight standing stake, pale, or palisado. Thus κελέοντες in Antiphon are briefly rendered ὀρθὰ ξύλα· but more expressly thus by Etymologus, Κελέοντες, κυρίως οἱ ἱστόποδες, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ καταπεπηγότα ξύλα, ἃ καὶ σταυροὺς καλοῦσι. This is the undoubted signification of *σταυρός*, in vain denied by Salmasius, who will have it first to signify the same with *furca*, and then with *crux;* first the figure of ϒ, and then of T. Whereas all antiquity renders it no other than as a straight and sharp stake: in which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime *σταύρωσις* or *ἀνασκολόπισις* being upon a single piece of wood, a *defixus et erectus stipes*. And the Greeks which wrote the Roman history used the word *σταυρός* as well for their *palus* as their *crux*. As when Antony beheaded Antigonus the king of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution; Ἀντίγονον ἐμαστίγωσε σταυρῷ προσδήσας· *Hist. Rom. lib.* xlix. *cap.* 22. not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the Roman custom, as those died in Livy, 'Deligati ad palum, virgisque cæsi, et securi percussi.' *Lib.* xxviii. *cap.* 29. So that *σταυρῷ προσδεῖν*, is 'ad palum deligare.' Thus were the heads of men said *ἀνασταυρωθῆναι*, as of Niger and Albinus in Dio, *lib.* lxxiv. *cap.* 8. *et lib.* lxxv. *cap.* 7. and Herodian, *lib.* iii. *cap.* 24. which cannot be meant but of a single palus: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inarus to death, Ἀνεσταύρωσε μὲν ἐπὶ τρισὶ σταυροῖς, not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierced his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharped at the upper end; as appears by the like Persian punishment inflicted by Parysatis on Mesabates, as delivered by Plutarch *in Artaxerxe, cap.* 17. Προσέταξεν ἐκδεῖραι ζῶντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπῆξαι, τὸ δὲ δέρμα χώρις διαπατταλεῦσαι· which the Latin translator renders *in tres sustolli cruces*, (a thing impossible;) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the *Excerpta* of Ctesias is delivered only in the word ἀνεσταυρίσθη. Σταυρός therefore is no more originally than *σκόλοψ*, a single stake, or an erect

of itself declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering, it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the evangelical relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

The form then of the cross on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple, but a compounded, figure, according to the custom of the Romans, by whose procurator he was condemned to die. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a transverse beam[98] fastened

piece of wood, upon which many suffered who were said *ἀνασταυροῦσθαι* and *ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι*. And when other transverse or prominent parts were added in a perfect cross, it retained still the original name, not only of *σταυρός*, but also of *σκόλοψ*· as *Ὤφειλεν εἰς ἐπίδειξεν θεότητος ἀπὸ τοῦ σκόλοπος γοῦν εὐθὺς ἀφανὴς γένεσθαι*, &c. *τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκόλοπος αὐτοῦ φωνὴν ὅτ' ἀπέπνει. Celsus apud Orig.* lib. ii. [§. 68, 58.] Thus in that long, or rather too long, verse written by Audax to St. Augustin, *Epist.* 139. [Ep. 260. S. Aug. ii. p. 887 C.]

Exspectat quos plena fides Christi de stipite pendens.

98 That the figure and parts of a Roman cross, such as that was on which our Saviour suffered, may be known, we must begin with the first composition in the frame or structure of it; and that is the conjunction of the two beams, the one erect, the other transverse; the first to which the body was applied, the second to which the hands were fastened. These two, as the chief parts of the cross, are several ways expressed: first, by the Jews, who had no one word in their language particularly to express that punishment, (as being not mentioned in the Law, or at all in use among them,) and therefore call it by a double name, expressing the conjunction of these beams, שתי וערב *stamen et subtegmen, the warp and the woof.* The Greeks express the same by the letter Ταῦ, as partly appears by what is already spoken of the number 300, and is yet more evident by the testimony of Lucian, who makes mankind complain of the letter Ταῦ, because tyrants in imitation of that first made the cross. *Τῷ γὰρ τούτου σώματί φασι τοὺς τυράννους ἀκολουθήσαντας, καὶ μιμησαμένους τὸ πλάσμα, ἔπειτα σχήματι τοιούτῳ ξύλα τεκτήνανταs, ἀνθρώπους ἀνασκολοπίζειν ἐπ' αὐτά. Jud. Vocal. cap.* 12. 'Ipsa est enim litera Græcorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 22. [p. 410 C.] St. Jerom affirms the same of the Samaritan *Tau:* but there is no similitude to be found in that which is now in use, or any other oriental, only in the Coptic alphabet *Salebdi*, that is the cross *Di.* These two parts of the cross are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship. So Justin Martyr: *Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ οὐ τέμνεται, ἢν μὴ τοῦτο τὸ τρόπαιον ὃ καλεῖται ἱστίον, ἐν τῇ νηΐ σῶον μείνῃ. Apolog.* i. §. 55. [p. 76 D.] and Tertullian: 'antenna navis crucis pars est.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 18. [p. 407 C.] and Minucius Felix: [p. 287. ed. 1672.] 'Signum sane crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur:' and Maximus Taurinensis; 'Cum a nautis scinditur mare, prius arbor erigitur, velum distenditur, ut cruce Domini facta aquarum fluenta rumpantur.' [*Hom.* ii. p. 198.] Now because the extremities of the antenna are a kind of *κέρατα*, (as Virgil, that great master of proprieties,

Cornua velatarum obvertimus antennarum; Æneid. iii. 549.)

therefore in Greek *κεραία* is *antenna:* and from thence the Greek Fathers applied the words of our Saviour, Matt. v. 18. *Ἰῶτα ἓν, ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται*, to the cross of Christ; *Τοῦ γὰρ σταυροῦ ἰῶτά ἐστι τὸ ὀμθὸν ξύλον, καὶ κεραία τὸ*

unto that towards the top thereof: and beside these two cutting 204
each other transversely at right angles (so that the erected part extended itself above the transverse), there was also another piece of wood[99] infixed into, and standing out from, that which

πλάγιον. Because Ἰῶτα is like the straight piece or mast of the cross, and κεραία the yard or transverse part; therefore some of the ancients interpreted this place of the cross, says Theophylact on the place. And Gregory Nyssen; Ἀληθῶς γὰρ τοῖς καθορᾷν δυναμένοις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὸν σταυρὸν θεωρεῖται μυστήριον· διό φησί που τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτι ἓκ τοῦ νόμον τὸ ἰῶτα καὶ ἡ κεραία οὐ παρέρχεται· σημαῖνον διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων τήν τε ἐκ πλαγίου γραμμὴν καὶ τὴν κάθετον, δι' ὧν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ καταγράφεται. *Lib.* ii. *de Vita Mosis.* [vol. i. p. 217 C.] Not that this is the true interpretation of that place (for κεραία signifies a part of a letter, as in Apollonius, *Syntax. lib.* i. *cap.* 7. Τοῦ ἃ τὴν κεραίαν ἀπήλειψε); but by that they testify their apprehension of the figure of a cross; which is well expressed by Eusebius, describing the form of the cross which appeared to Constantine, Ὕψηλον δόρυ χρυσῷ κατημφιεσμένον, κέρας εἶχεν ἐγκάρσιον, σταυροῦ σχήματι πεποιημένον. *De Vita Constant. lib.* i. *cap.* 31. [p. 516.] And this similitude of the mast and yard leads to the consideration of that part of the erected pale, which was eminent above the transverse beam. For as the καρχήσιον was above the κεραία, so the *stipes* did extend itself above the *patibulum*. And this is evident by those expressions which make the two beams have four sides, and four extremities, as two lines cutting each other at equal angles needs must have. These Theophanes, *Homil.* 4. [p. 19 C.] and Gregory Nyssen, *in Christi Resur. Orat.* i. [vol. iii. p. 396 D.] call τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου τέσσαρας προβολάς· Damascenus, *Orthod. Fid. lib.* iv. *cap.* 11. [vol. i. p. 264 B.] τὰ τέσσαρα ἄκρα τοῦ σταυροῦ διὰ τοῦ μέσου κέντρου κρατούμενα καὶ συσφιγγόμενα. Hence Nonnus calls the cross δόρυ τετράπλευρον. And of these four parts the Fathers interpret the height and breadth, and length and depth, mentioned by St. Paul, Eph. iii. 18. As Gregory Nyssen: Ἐφεσίοις τὴν τὸ πᾶν διακρατοῦσάν τε καὶ συνέχουσαν δύναμιν τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ καταγράφει—ὕψος καὶ βάθος καὶ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος κατονομάζων, ἑκάστην κεραίαν τῶν κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ θεωρουμένων, ἰδίοις προσαγορεύων ὀνόμασιν· ὡς τὸ μὲν ἄνω μέρος ὕψος εἰπεῖν· βάθος δὲ τὸ μετὰ τὴν συμβολὴν ὑποκείμενον· τὴν δὲ ἐγκάρσιον καθ' ἑκάτερον κερσίαν τῷ τοῦ μήκους τε καὶ πλάτους ὀνόματι διασημαίνων. *Cont. Eunom. Orat.* 4. [vol. ii. p. 582 D.] et *idem Catech. Orat. cap.* 32. et *in Christi Resur. Orat.* 1. And St. Augustin makes the same interpretation: 'In hoc mysterio figura crucis ostenditur;' which he thus expresseth; 'Latitudo est in eo ligno quod transversum desuper figitur;—longitudo in eo quod ab ipso ligno usque ad terram conspicuum est;—altitudo est in ea ligni parte, quæ ab illo quod transversum figitur sursum versus relinquitur, hoc est, ad caput crucifixi,' &c. *Epist.* cxx. *cap.* 26. [Ep. cxl. 64. vol. ii. p. 446 D.] *et alibi sæpe.* These four parts are severally expressed by the ancients, and particularly by the figure of a man with his hands stretched forth; which is the most proper similitude, because the cross was first made and adapted to that figure. 'Quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, quod humerorum obliquatio cornuat, si statueris hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris.' *Tertul. ad Nat. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 49 D.]

[99] Beside the direct and transverse part of the cross, with their four extremities, which only usually are considered, and represented in the figures, we must find yet another part, and a fifth extremity. Irenæus giving several examples of the number Five, delivers it plainly thus; 'Ipse habitus crucis fines et summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, et duos in latitudine, et unum in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur.' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* ii. *cap.* 24. [§. 4. p. 151.] Besides therefore the four extremities of the direct and transverse beams, there was a fifth ἄκρον *in*

was erected and straight up. To that erected piece was his body, being lifted up, applied, as Moses' serpent to the pole; and to the transverse beam his hands were nailed: upon the lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred body rested, and his feet were transfixed and fastened with nails: his head, being pressed with a crown of thorns, was applied to that part of the erect which stood above the transverse beam; and above
205 his head, to that was fastened the table[1] on which was written,

medio (viz. of the erected *palus*), on which the crucified body rested. This fifth part of the cross fastened to the *arrectarius stipes* was before Irenæus acknowledged and described by Justin Martyr, under the notion of the horn of the rhinoceros, taken to be a figure or type of the cross. Μονοκέρωτος γὰρ κέρατα οὐδενὸς ἄλλου πράγματος ἢ σχήματος ἔχοι ἄν τις εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποδεῖξαι, εἰ μὴ τοῦ τύπου ὃς τὸν σταυρὸν δείκνυσιν. ὄρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἕν ἐστι ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστι τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ὑπερῳρμένον, ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον προσαρμοσθῇ, καὶ ἑκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τῷ ἑνὶ κέρατι παρεζευγμένα τὰ ἄκρα φαίνηται· καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστὶν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι· καὶ βλέπεται ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις κέρασι συνεσχηματισμένον καὶ πεπηγμένον. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 91. [p. 188 C.] Where beside the ὄρθιον ξύλον, or *arrectarius stipes*, and the ἄλλο ξύλον, or *transversarium lignum*, there is a third, τὸ ἐν μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, *fastened in the middle*; ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι, says he: 'ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur,' says Irenæus. So Tertullian; 'Pars crucis, et quidem majus, est omne robur quod de recta statione defigitur. Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antenna scilicet sua, et cum illo sedilis excessu.' *Ad Nat. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 49 C.] Where the *excessus* is the τὸ ἐξέχον, signifying the nature, as the *sedile* signifieth the use of the part. Which in another place, in imitation of Justinus, he refers unto the typical unicorn: 'Nam et in antenna navis, quæ crucis pars est, extremitates cornua vocantur: unicornis autem, media stipitis, palus.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iii. *cap.* 18. [p. 307 C.] *et adv. Jud. cap.* 11. To this *sedile* in the cross Mæcenas seemeth to allude in those words in Seneca;

Hanc mihi, vel acuta
Si sedeam cruce, sustine.

And Seneca himself does expound him, 'Suffigas licet, et acutam sessuro crucem subdas; est tanti, vulnus suum premere, et patibulo pendere districtum.' *Epist.* 101. Of this Innocentius the First [Third] also speaks, *Serm.* 1. *de uno Mart.* [vol. i. p. 171.] 'Fuerunt in cruce Dominica ligna quatuor; stipes erectus, et lignum transversum, truncus suppositus, et titulus superpositus.' This Gregorius Turonensis, after the use of the cross was long omitted, interpreted of *suppedaneum*, a piece of wood fastened under the feet of him that suffered: 'Clavorum ergo Dominicorum gratia, quod quatuor fuerint, hæc est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis, et duo in plantis; et quæritur cur plantæ affixæ sint quæ in cruce sancta dependere visæ sunt potius quam stare. Sed in stipite erecto foramen factum manifestum est. Pes quoque parvulæ tabellæ in hoc foramen insertus est. Super hanc vero tabulam tanquam stantis hominis sacræ affixæ sunt plantæ.' *De Glor. Mart. cap.* 6. [p. 727 D.]

[1] That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by St. Luke ἐπιγραφή, by St. Matthew αἰτία, by St. Mark ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας, and by St. John τίτλος, making use of a Latin word, as is observed by Nonnus; [xix. v. 101.]

Καὶ Πιλάτος θεηπτὸν ἐπέγραφε μάρτυρι γόμφῳ
Γράμμα, τόπερ καλέουσι Λατινίδι τίτλον ἰωῇ.

From all which we may collect, that there was an inscription written over the head of our Saviour, signifying the accusation and pretended crime for which he was condemned to that death. *Gloss. Vet.* Αἰτία, *causa, materia, titulus.*

in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin characters, the accusation, according to the Roman custom; *and the writing was,* JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

John xix. 19.

Thus by the propriety of the punishment, and the titular inscription, we know what crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what accusation Pilate did at last proceed to pass the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the Law of Moses, not any danger threatened to the temple, but pretended sedition and affectation of the crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him; *We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying, that he himself is Christ a King.* And when Pilate sought to release him, they cried out, saying, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's*

Luke xxiii. 2.

John xix. 12.

As Ovid;

Causa, superpositæ scripto testata coronæ,
Servatos cives indicat hujus ope.
Trist. lib. iii. Eleg. 1. v. 47.

that is, OB CIVES SERVATOS was ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας, *causa scripto testata.* In the language of Suetonius; 'Titulus, qui causam pœnæ indicaret;' *Calig. cap.* 32. as Ovid;

Vixit, ut occideret damnatus crimine regni:
Hunc illi titulum longa senecta dabat. Fast. lib. vi. ver. 189.

This was done according to the Roman custom; as we read in Dio of the son of Cæpio, Τὸν δοῦλον—τὸν προδόντα αὐτὸν, διά τε τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσης μετὰ γραμμάτων τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς θανατώσεως αὐτοῦ δηλούντων, διαγαγόντος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνασταυρώσαντος. *Lib.* liv. *cap.* 3. This title was written upon a table, and that table fastened to the upper part of the cross. The Syriac, Arabic, and Persian translations render τίτλον expressly a *table:* and Hesychius, Τίτλος, πτυχίον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον (not ἔχων, as it is printed), not the inscription itself, but that upon which the inscription was written. Thus the epistle of the French unto the Christians in Asia represents the inscription of the martyr Attalus in a table: Περιαχθεὶς κύκλῳ τοῦ ἀμφιθεάτρου, πίνακος αὐτὸν προάγοντος, ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο Ῥωμαϊστὶ, Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἄτταλος ὁ Χριστιανός. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. [p. 206.] And Sozomen, describing the invention of the cross by Helena, says there were three several crosses in the same place: Καὶ χωρὶς ἄλλο ξύλον ἐν τάξει λευκώματος, ῥήμασι καὶ γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς, Ἑλληνικοῖς τε καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 1. [p. 44.] This Nicephorus calls λευκὴν σανίδα, which is the proper interpretation of λεύκωμα. Suidas, Λεύκωμα, τοῖχος (*Etymol.* πίναξ) γύψῳ ἀληλειμμένος πρὸς γραφὴν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιτήδειος. *Hesych.* Σανὶς, θύρα, λεύκωμα (as Julius Pollux joins σανὶς and λεύκωμα together), ἐν ᾧ αἱ γραφαὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐγράφοντο πρὸς τοὺς κακούργους· τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύρου, *leg.* σταυροῦ. His meaning is, that such a λεύκωμα as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the cross on which they suffered; and without question he spake this in reference to our Saviour's cross, because he used in a manner the same words with St. John: Τίθεται ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, says Hesychius; Ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ. saith St. John, xix. 19. It was therefore a table of wood whited and fastened to the top of the cross, on which the accusation or crime was written, as it is expressed by Nicephorus: Σανὶς ἑτέρα λευκὴ, ᾗ βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων γράφων διαφόροις γράμμασιν ὁ Πιλάτος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐτίθει, ἐν εἴδει στήλης βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸν σταυρωθέντα κηρύττων. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* viii. *cap.* 29. And thus there were, as Xanthopulus observes,

Ὁ σταυρὸς, ἦλοι, καὶ γραφῆς τίτλος ἄνω.

friend: whosoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Cæsar. This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the cross was by the Roman custom used for that crime[2], to crucify him.

Two things are most observable in this cross; the acerbity, and the ignominy of the punishment: for of all the Roman ways of execution it was most painful and most shameful[3]. First, the exquisite pains and torments in that death are manifest, in that the hands and feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous, and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with nails; which caused, not a sudden despatch, but a lingering and tormenting death: insomuch that the Romans, who most used this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of pains and cruciation[4] from the cross. And the acerbity of this punishment appears, in that those who were of any merciful disposition would first cause such as were adjudged to the cross to be slain[5], and then to be crucified.

As this death was most dolorous and full of acerbity, so was it also most infamous and full of ignominy. The Romans themselves accounted it a servile punishment[6], and inflicted it upon 206

2 'Auctores seditionis et tumultus, vel concitatores populi, pro qualitate dignitatis, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut bestiis objiciuntur, aut in insulam deportantur.' *Jul. Paulus, lib.* v. *tit.* 22.

3 'Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortium.' *S. August. Tract.* 36. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part ii. p. 545 F.] Tully calls it 'crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium;' *lib.* v. *in Verr. cap.* 66. and Apuleius 'pœna extrema.' *De Aur. Asin. lib.* x.

4 'Ubi dolores acerrimi exagitant, cruciatus vocatur, a cruce nominatus: pendentes enim in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pedibus manibusque confixi, producta morte necabantur. Non enim crucifigi hoc erat occidi; sed diu vivebatur in cruce: non quia longior vita eligebatur, sed quia mors ipsa protendebatur, ne dolor citius finiretur.' *S. Augˆust. Tract.* 36. *in Joan.* To this etymology did Terence allude in those words,

——— *Et illis crucibus, quæ nos nostramque adolescentiam*
Habent despicatui, et quæ nos semper omnibus cruciant modis.———
Eunuch. act. ii. sc. 3. v. 91.

5 As it was observed of Julius Cæsar: 'Piratas a quibus captus est cum in ditionem redegisset, quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante juraverat, jugulari prius jussit, deinde suffigi.' *Suet. lib.* i. *cap.* 74.

6 Vulcatius Gallicanus relateth of Avidius Cassius, in the case of some centurions which had been prosperous, but in fighting without orders given: 'Rapi eos jussit, et in crucem tolli, servilique supplicio affici; quod exemplum non exstabat.' *Cap.* 4. And Juvenal speaks with relation to this custom,

Pone crucem servo———
Sat. vi. ver. 219.

So Palæstrio in Plautus;

Nisi quidem illa nos volt, qui servi sumus,
Propter amorem suum omnes crucibus contubernales dari.
Mil. Glor. act. ii. sc. 2. ver. 28.

And again:—

their slaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonour upon any free-man, and the greatest indignity which the most undeserving Roman[7] could possibly suffer in himself, or could be contrived to shew their detestation to such creatures as were below human nature[8]. And because, when a man is

Noli minitari; scio crucem futuram mihi sepulchrum.
Ibi mei majores sunt siti, pater, avus, proavus, abavus.
Ibid. act. ii. sc. 4. ver. 19.

So in Terence,

—— Pam. *Quid meritus es?* Dav. *Crucem.*
Andr. act. iii. sc. 5. ver. 15.

And Horace,

Si quis eum servum, patinam qui tollere jussus,
Semesos pisces tepidumque ligurrierit jus,
In cruce suffigat——
Lib. i. Sat. iii. ver. 80.

So Capitolinus of Pertinax, 'In crucem sublatis talibus servis;' *cap.* 9. and Herodian of Macrinus, Δοῦλοι ὅσοι δεσπότας κατήγγελλον ἀνεσκολοπίσθησαν. *Lib.* v. *cap.* 2. This punishment of the cross did so properly belong to the slaves, that when servants and freemen were involved alike in the same crime, they were very careful to make a distinction in their death, according to their condition: 'Ut quisque liber aut servus esset, suæ fortunæ a quoque sumptum supplicium est.' *Liv. lib.* iii. *cap.* 18. And then the servants were always crucified, as Servius observes among the Lacedæmonians; 'Servos patibulis suffixerunt, filios strangulavere, nepotes fugaverunt.' *Com. in Æneid.* iii. *v.* 551. 'Novercæ quidem perpetuum indicitur exilium; servus vero patibulo suffigitur.' *Apul. de Aur. Asin. lib.* x. Thus in the combustion at Rome, upon the death of Julius Cæsar; Ἀμυνόμενοι ἀνῃρέθησαν ἔνιοι, καὶ συλληφθέντες, ἕτεροι ἐκρεμάσθησαν, ὅσοι θεράποντες ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ ἐλεύθεροι κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ κατερρίφησαν. *Appian. de Bell. Civil. lib.* iii. [c. 3.] 'Ea nocte speculatores prehensi servi tres, et unus ex legione vernacula: servi sunt in crucem sublati, militi cervices abscissæ.' *Hirt. lib. de Bell. Hispan. cap.* 20. So Africanus 'gravius in Romanos, quam in Latinos transfugas animadvertit: illos enim, tanquam patriæ fugitivos, crucibus affixit; hos, tanquam perfidos socios, securi percussit.' *Valer. Max. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [§. 12.] This punishment of the cross was so proper unto servants, that *servile supplicium* in the language of the Romans signifies the same: and though in the words of Vulcatius before cited they go both together, as also in Capitolinus, 'Nam et in crucem milites tulit, et servilibus suppliciis semper affecit,' *In Macrino, cap.* 12. yet either is sufficient to express crucifixion: as in Tacitus, 'Malam potentiam servili supplicio expiavit;' *Hist. lib.* iv. *cap.* 11. and again, 'Sumptum de eo supplicium in servilem modum.' *Hist. lib.* ii. *cap.* 72. And therefore when any servants were made free, they were put out of fear of ever suffering this punishment. 'An vero servos nostros horum suppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberavit? Nos a verberibus, ab unco, a crucis denique terrore, neque res gestæ, neque acta ætas, neque nostri honores vindicabunt?' *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir. cap.* 5. [§. 16.]

7 'Carnifex, et obductio capitis, et nomen ipsum *crucis* absit, non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus atque perpessio, sed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio ipsa denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est.' *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir. cap.* 5. 'Facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere? [crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium?] verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest.' *Idem, act.* ii. *lib.* v. *in Verr. cap.* 66.

8 As when the Capitol was betrayed by the silence of dogs, but preserved by the noise of geese; they preserved the memory by a solemn honouring of the one yearly, and dishonouring the other.

beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their breathless corpse[9], by virtue of this punishment, suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the cross, hath been thought a sufficient ignominy to those which died, and terror to those which lived to see it[10]. Yea, where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts, to take their representations preserved in their pictures, and affix them to the cross[11]. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour's sufferings, the bitterness of pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

It is necessary we should thus profess faith in Christ *crucified*, as that punishment which he chose to undergo, as that way which he was pleased to die. First, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the malediction of the Law. For we were all under the curse, because it is expressly written, *Cursed* Deut. xxvii. 26. Gal. iii. 10.
is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in
207 *the book of the Law to do them:* and it is certain none of us hath so continued; for the *Scripture hath concluded all under sin,* Verse 22.

'Eadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt inter ædem Juventutis et Summani, vivi in furca sambucea arbore fixi.' *Plin. lib.* xxix. *cap.* 4. [c. 14.] Πομπεύει μέχρι νῦν ἐπὶ μνήμῃ τῶν τότε συμπτωμάτων ἡ τύχη, κύων μὲν ἀνασταυρωμένος, χὴν δὲ μάλα σεμνῶς ἐπὶ στρωμνῆς πολυτελοῦς καὶ φορείου καθήμενος. *Plutarch. de Fort. Rom.* [p. 325 D.]

9 As Orœtes the Persian, when he had treacherously and cruelly murdered Polycrates the tyrant of Samos, ἀποκτείνας δέ μιν οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος ἀνεσταύρωσε. *Herodot. lib.* iii. *cap.* 125. So Antiochus first cut off the head of Achæus, and then fastened his body to a cross: Ἔδοξε πρῶτον μὲν ἀκρωτηριάσαι τὸν ταλαίπωρον· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντας αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταρράψαντας εἰς ὄνειον ἀσκὸν, ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα. *Polyb. lib.* viii. *cap.* 23.

10 This was the design of Tarquinius Priscus, when the extremity of labour which he laid upon his subjects made many lay violent hands upon themselves: 'Passim conscita nece Quiritibus tædium fugientibus, novum et inexcogitatum antea posteaque remedium invenit ille rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum figeret crucibus corpora spectanda civibus, simul et feris volucribusque laceranda:' *Plin. lib.* xxxvi. *cap.* 15. [c. xxiv. §. 3.] who makes this handsome observation of it: 'Quamobrem pudor Romani nominis proprius, qui sæpe res perditas servavit in prœliis, tunc quoque subvenit: sed illo tempore imposuit, tum erubescens cum puderet vivos, tanquam puditurum esset extinctos.' [Ibid.]

11 Thus they used Celsus, one of the thirty tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio testifieth: 'Novo injuriæ genere imago in crucem sublata, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videretur affixus.' *Cap.* 29.

which is nothing else but a breach of the Law: therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now
Gal. iii. 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us;* that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the Law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid only upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the Law: for
Deut. xxi. 23. it was written, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* Not that suspension was any of the capital punishments prescribed by the Law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custom of the Jews they were wont to punish their malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death according to the law or custom of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact ofttimes after death exposed to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those who being dead were so hanged on a tree[12], were accursed by the Law. Now though Christ was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the Law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged, which is, *the hanging on a tree.* For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth on the cross: and therefore true and formal crucifixion is often named by the general word suspension[13]; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed

12 Deut. xxi. 22. *If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree.* In which words, *being put to death* precedeth *being hanged:* but, I confess, in our English translation it hath another sense, *and he be to be put to death,* as if he were to die by hanging: and so the Vulgar Latin, *Et adjudicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo,* as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were suspension: and the Syriac yet more expressly, *Et appendatur ligno atque interficiatur.* But there is no such sentence contained in the original as the Vulgar, nor futurition of death, as our English translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is והומת in *Hophal,* that is, *interfectus, occisus, mori factus fuerit;* or, as the LXX. clearly translate it, καὶ ἀποθάνῃ, and the Chaldee ויתקטל *et occisus fuerit.*

13 As we before noted on the words of Seneca. Thus the Greeks do often use κρεμᾶν, for *crucifigere.* For Curtius, speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, 'Duo millia—crucibus affixi per ingens littoris spatium pependerunt:' *Lib.* iv. *cap.* 4. [c. 19.] and Diodorus Siculus relating the same, Τοὺς δὲ νέους πάντας ὄντας οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν δισχιλίων ἐκρέμασεν. *lib.* xvii. *cap.* 46. So the same Curtius testifies that Musicanus was *in crucem sublatus; lib.* ix. *cap.* 8. of whom Arrianus speaks thus; Τοῦτον κρεμάσαι Ἀλέξανδρος κελεύει ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ γῇ. *De Exped. Alex. lib.* vi. *cap.* 17. Thus in the language of the Scriptures, Εἷς τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων is one of the crucified thieves; Luke xxiii. 39:

Saviour by that very name to which the curse is affixed by Moses[14]; and generally have objected that he died a cursed death[15].

Secondly, it was necessary to express our faith in Christ *crucified*, that we might be assured that he hath *abolished in his flesh the enmity*, even *the law of commandments;* which if he had not done, the strength and power of the whole Law had still remained: for all the people had said *Amen* to the curse upon every one that kept not the whole law; *and entered into a curse and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgments and his statutes.* Which was in the nature of a bill, bond, or obligation, perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the condition. But the strongest obligations may be cancelled; and one ancient custom of cancelling bonds was, by striking a nail through the
208 writing: and thus God, by our crucified Saviour, *blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.*

Eph. ii. 15. Deut. xxvii. 25. Neh. x. 29. Col. ii. 14.

Thirdly, hereby we are to testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion[16]. For we are to be *planted in the likeness of his death;* and that we

Rom. vi. 5, 6.

and the Jews are said to have slain our Saviour, κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου, Acts v. 30. and x. 39. The Latins likewise often use the word *suspendere* for *crucifigere*. As Ausonius, in the Idyllium whose title is *Cupido cruci affixus, v.* 59. describes him thus,

Hujus in excelso suspensum stipite Amorem;

and when we read in Polybius, that they did ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα of Achæus; *lib.* viii. *cap.* 23. Ovid describes his punishment thus,

More vel intereas capti suspensus Achæi,
Qui miser aurifera teste pependit aqua. Ibis v. 301.

14 The words of Moses are, Deut. xxi. 23. קללת אלהים תלוי, *maledictio Dei suspensus:* and this word תלוי, which is of itself simply *suspensus,* (as 2 Sam. xviii. 10. I saw Absalom תלוי באלה *hanged on an oak,*) is ordinarily attributed by the Jews to our Saviour, to signify that he was crucified. Hence they term Christians עובדי התלוי *cultores suspensi;* and they call the crucifix צורת תלוי *figuram suspensi.*

15 So Trypho the Jew objected to Justin Martyr: Οὗτος δὲ ὁ ὑμέτερος λεγόμενος Χριστὸς ἄτιμος καὶ ἄδοξος γέγονεν, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κατάρᾳ τῇ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπεσεῖν· ἐσταυρώθη γάρ. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 32. [p. 129 B.]

16 Ἐνόησα γὰρ ὑμᾶς κατηρτισμένους ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει, ὥσπερ καθηλωμένους ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.* §. 1. [p. 34.] St. Augustin speaking of the Church; 'Mundatur ut non habeat maculam, extenditur ut non habeat rugam: Ubi eam extendit fullo, nisi in ligno? Videmus quotidie a fullonibus tunicas quodammodo crucifigi: crucifiguntur ut rugam non habeant.' *Enar. in Psal.* 132. [§. 9. vol. iv. part ii. p. 1489 A.] Ἀναφερόμενοι εἰς τὰ ὕψη διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅ ἐστι σταυρὸς, σχοινίῳ χρώμενοι τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes.* §. 9. [p. 14.]

may be so, we must acknowledge, and cause it to appear, that *our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be*
Gal. v. 24. *destroyed;* we must confess, that *they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts;* and they which
Gal. vi. 14. have not, are not his. We must not *glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ:* nor can we properly glory in that, except *by it the world be crucified unto* us, *and* we *unto the world.*

Fourthly, by the acerbity of this passion we are taught to meditate on that bitter cup which our Saviour drank; and while we think on those nails which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their dolorous impressions they forced a most painful death, to acknowledge the bitterness of his sufferings for us, and to assure ourselves that by the worst of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death[17]; and with patience and cheerfulness to endure whatsoever he shall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readiness and desire suffered far more for us.

Fifthly, by the ignominy of this punishment, and universal infamy of that death, we are taught how far our Saviour descended for us, that while we were slaves and in bondage
Phil. ii. 7, 8. unto sin, he might redeem us by a servile death: for he *made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant;* and so *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross:* teaching us the glorious doctrine of humility[18] and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befall us in this world; and encouraging us to
Heb. xii. 2. imitate him, *who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame;* and withal deterring us from that
Heb. vi. 6. fearful sin of falling from him, lest we should *crucify unto ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame,* and so become worse than the Jews themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of Jerusalem, and for that unparalleled sin were delivered into the hands of the Romans, into whose hands they delivered him, and at the same walls in such

17 'Mori voluit pro nobis: parum dicimus, crucifigi dignatus est; usque ad mortem crucis obediens factus. Elegit extremum et pessimum genus mortis, qui omnem fuerat ablaturus mortem: de morte pessima occidit omnem mortem.' *S. August. Tract.* 36. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part ii. p. 545 F.]

18 'Humilitatis enim magister est Christus, qui humiliavit semetipsum, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.' *S. August. Tract.* 51. *in Joan.* [§. 3. ib. p. 635 D.]

multitudes were crucified, till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies[19].

Lastly, by the public visibility of this death, we are assured that our Saviour was truly dead, and that all his enemies were fully satisfied. He was crucified in the sight of all the Jews, who were made public witnesses that he gave up the ghost. There were many traditions among the Heathen, of persons supposed for some time to be dead, to descend into hell, and afterwards to live again; but the death of these persons was never publicly seen or certainly known. It is easy for a man that liveth to say that he hath been dead; and, if he be of great
209 authority, it is not difficult to persuade some credulous persons to believe it. But that which would make his present life truly miraculous, must be the reality and certainty of his former death. The feigned histories of Pythagoras and Zamolxis, of Theseus and Hercules, of Orpheus and Protesilaus, made no certain mention of their deaths, and therefore were ridiculous in the assertion of their resurrection from death. Christ, as he appeared to certain witnesses after his resurrection, so he died before his enemies visibly on the cross, and gave up the ghost conspicuously in the sight of the world[20].

And now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the cross on which our Saviour suffered, every one may understand what it is he professeth when he declareth

19 Προσήλουν δ' οἱ στρατιῶται δι' ὀργὴν καὶ μῖσος τοὺς ἁλόντας, ἄλλον ἄλλῳ σχήματι πρὸς χλεύην, καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος χώρα τε ἐνελείπετο τοῖς σταυροῖς, καὶ σταυροὶ τοῖς σώμασιν. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib.* vi. *cap.* 28.

20 This is excellently observed and expressed by Origen, who returneth this answer to the objection made by the Jews in Celsus, of those fabulous returns from the dead: Φέρε παραστήσωμεν, ὅτι οὐ δύναται τὸ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱστορούμενον ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγηγέρθαι τούτοις παραβάλλεσθαι. Ἕκαστος μὲν γὰρ τῶν λεγομένων κατὰ τοὺς τόπους ἡρώων βουληθεὶς ἂν ἐδυνήθη ἑαυτὸν ὑπεκκλέψαι τῆς ὄψεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάλιν κρίνας ἐπανελθεῖν πρὸς οὓς καταλέλοιπεν· Ἰησοῦ δὲ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ πάντων Ἰουδαίων, καὶ καθαιρεθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος ἐν ὄψει τοῦ δήμου αὐτῶν, πῶς οἴονται τὸ παραπλήσιον πλάσασθαι, λέγειν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱστορουμένοις ἥρωσιν εἰς ᾅδου καταβεβηκέναι, κἀκεῖθεν ἀνεληλυθέναι; φάμεν δ' ὅτι μήποτε πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ ἐσταυρῶσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοιοῦτο λέγοιτ' ἂν, μάλιστα διὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἡρώων ἱστορηθέντα τῶν εἰς ᾅδου καταβεβηκέναι βίᾳ νομιζομένων. ὅτι εἰ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐτεθνήκει ἀσήμῳ θανάτῳ, οὐχ ὥστε δῆλος εἶναι ἀποθανὼν ὅλῳ τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτ' ἀληθῶς ἦν ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, χώραν εἶχεν ἂν τὸ ὑπονοηθὲν περὶ τῶν ἡρώων, καὶ περὶ τούτου λεχθῆναι· μὴ ποτ' οὖν πρὸς ἄλλοις αἰτίοις τοῦ σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τοῦτο δύναται συμβάλλεσθαι τῷ αὐτὸν ἐπισήμως ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀποτεθνηκέναι, ἵνα μηδεὶς ἔχῃ λέγειν, ὅτι ἑκὼν ὑπεξέστη τῆς ὄψεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἔδοξεν ἀποτεθνηκέναι, οὐκ ἀποτέθνηκε δέ· ἀλλ' ἐπιφανεὶς ἐτερατεύσατο τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. *Cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [c. 56. vol. i. p. 430 D.]

his faith, and saith, I believe in Christ *crucified*. For thereby he is understood and obliged to speak thus much: I am really persuaded, and fully satisfied, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancel the handwriting which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of a servant, and in that form did willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custom, to the cross; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain; and of the greatest ignominy, *despising the shame*. And thus I believe in Christ *crucified*.

Dead.

THOUGH crucifixion of itself involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastened to a cross is so leisurely to die, as that he being taken from the same may live; though when the insulting Jews in a malicious derision called to our Saviour to *save himself*, and *come down from the cross;* he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us: yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfilled the utmost intention of crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him *crucified*, we believe him *dead*.

Matt. xxvii. 42.

For the illustration of which part of the Article, it will be necessary, first, to shew that the Messias was to die; that no sufferings, howsoever shameful and painful, were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death: secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not only suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life, but upon and by the same did finish this life by a true and proper death: thirdly, to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more than this cannot be necessary to shew we believe that Christ *was dead*.

1 Cor. xv. 3. First then, we must consider what St. Paul *delivered* to the Corinthians *first of all*, and what *also* he *received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures;* that the Messias was 210

Rev. xiii. 8. the *Lamb slain before the foundations of the world*, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an express and lively

type of the promised Messias; though, after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though Abraham be said to have *offered up his only-begotten son,* when Isaac died not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastened to the cross, and offered up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being *without effusion of blood there is no remission,* without death no sacrifice for sin; being the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the antitype, but rather suppose and assert it as presignifying his resurrection from the dead, *from whence* Abraham *received him in a figure;* we may safely affirm the ancient and legal types did represent a Christ which was to die. It was an essential part of the Paschal Law, that the lamb should be slain: and in the sacrifices for sin, which presignified a Saviour to *sanctify the people with his own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary.*

Heb. xi. 17. Heb. ix. 22. Heb. xi. 19. Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

Nor did the types only require, but the prophecies also foretel, his death. For *he was brought,* saith Isaiah, *as a lamb to the slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living,* saith the same Prophet; and *made his soul an offering for sin.* Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the Jews shew not the least appearance of probability in their evasions[21].

Isa. liii. 7, 8, 10.

Being then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messias was to die, and that a violent death; being we have

21 That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messias, I have already proved against the Jews, out of the text, and their own traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the *land of the living* is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Jarchi, מארץ חיים היא ארץ ישראל *From the land of the living, that is, the land of Israel.* And D. Kimchi endeavours to prove that exposition out of David, כי נגזר מארץ חיים כאשר גלה מארצו שנקראת ארץ חיים כמו אתהלך לפני יי׳ בארצות החיים: as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in the *land of the living:* whereas there is no more in that phrase than that he will serve God while he liveth. As Psal. xxvii. 13. *I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living;* and Isa. xxxviii. 11. *I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living;* which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow: *I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world.* The *land of the living* then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they persuade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be *cut off out of the land of the living* is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, to die.

already proved there is but one Messias foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places, which they will not acknowledge, that he was to be slain: it followeth by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised Messias was ordained to die: which is our first assertion.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these types and pro-
1 Cor. v. 7. phecies, that *Christ our Passover is slain;* that he whom we believe to be the true and only Messias did really and truly die. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denial. Jesus of Nazareth upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtained, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believed it, even they were satisfied with it: the chief priests, the scribes and the Pharisees, the publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadducees most of all, who hugged their old opinion, and loved their error the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denied or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the sun put on mourning? why were the graves opened, but for a funeral? Why did the earth quake? why were the rocks rent? why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of 211
nature died? Why did all the people, who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such tragic spectacles, why did they beat their breasts and return, but that they were
John xix. 30. assured *it was finished,* there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciless soldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to despatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villainy they pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man; thereby becoming stronger witnesses than they would, by being less the authors than they desired, of his death. For out of his sacred but wounded side came blood and water, both as evident signs of his present death, as certain seals of our future and eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The sacrament of Baptism, the water through which we pass into the Church of Christ, teacheth us that he died to
Rom. vi. 3. whom we come. *For know ye not,* saith St. Paul, *that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?*

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread broken, and the wine poured forth, signify that he died which instituted it; and *as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lord's death till he come.* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the cross; and that not by a feigned or metaphorical, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which we the sons of Adam have; so did he undergo a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die. Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation[22]; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life itself consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the soul: and the intimate presence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which soul from the body in man, our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition; *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* Matt. x. 28. Now being death is nothing else but the privation or recession of life[23], and we are then properly said to die when we cease to live; being life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection; death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul[24], before united to the body. As therefore when the

22 Τὸ ἔμψυχον δὴ τοῦ ἀψύχου δυοῖν μάλιστα διαφέρειν δοκεῖ, κινήσει τε καὶ τῷ αἰσθάνεσθαι. παρειλήφαμεν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγενεστέρων σχεδὸν δύο ταῦτα περὶ ψυχῆς. *Aristot. de Anima, lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [§. 2.] Ὧι διαφέρει τὰ ἄψυχα (*leg.* ἔμψυχα) τῶν ἀψύχων, τοῦτο ἔστι ψυχή· διαφέρει δὲ κινήσει, αἰσθήσει, φαντασίᾳ, νοήσει. *Sallust. de Diis et Mundo, cap.* 8.

23 As Secundus, Φυγὴ καὶ ἀπόκτησις βίου.

24 As the Philosophers have anciently expressed it, especially Plato, who by the advantage of an error in the original of souls, best understood the end of life: Τοῦτό γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. *In Phædone.* [p. 67 D.] Again, Ὁ θάνατος τυγχάνει ὤν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ δυοῖν πραγμάτοιν διάλυσις, τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπ' ἀλλήλοιν. *In Gorgia.* [p. 524 B.] And more plainly and fully yet: Ἠγούμεθά τι τὸν θάνατον εἶναι; Πάνυ γ', ἔφη ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Σιμμίας. Ἆρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγήν; καὶ εἶναι τοῦτο τὸ τεθνάναι, χωρὶς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαλλαγὲν αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ τὸ σῶμα γεγονέναι, χωρὶς δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγεῖσαν αὐτὴν καθ' αὑτὴν εἶναι; ἆρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὁ θάνατος ἢ τοῦτο; Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο, ἔφη. *In Phædone.* [p. 64 C.] Thus with four several words, λύσις, διάλυσις, χωρισμός, and ἀπαλλαγή, doth Plato express the separation of the soul from the body, and maketh death formally to consist of that separation. This solution is excellently expressed by Phocylides;

Οὐ καλὸν ἁρμονίην ἀναλυέμεν ἀνθρώποιο·

soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vital activity, we say that body or that man is dead: so when we read that Christ our Saviour died, we must conceive that was a true and proper death, and consequently that his body was bereft of his soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

Nor is this only our conception, or a doubtful truth; but we 212
are as much assured of the propriety of his death, as of the death itself. For that the unspotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of natural life by the secession of that soul, appeareth by
Luke xxiii 46. his own resignation, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;* and by the Evangelist's expression, *and having said thus, he gave up the ghost*[25]. When he was to die, he resigned his soul, when he *gave* it *up*, he died; when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body dead[26]: and so the eternal Son of God upon the cross did properly and truly die.

Ψυχαὶ γὰρ μίμνουσιν ἀκήριοι ἐν φθιμένοισι.

Πνεῦμα γάρ ἐστι θεοῦ χρῆσις θνητοῖσι καὶ εἰκών.

Σῶμα γὰρ ἐκ γαίης ἔχομεν· καὶ πάντες ἐς αὐτὴν

Λυόμενοι κόνις ἐσμὲν, ἀὴρ δ' ἀνὰ πνεῦμα δέδεκται. *Carm. admon. v.* 97.

So Tertullian: 'Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis animæque.' *De Anim. cap.* 51. [p. 301 B.] 'Si mors non aliud determinatur, quam disjunctio corporis animæque, contrarium morti vita non aliud definietur, quam conjunctio corporis animæque.' *Ibid. cap.* 27. [p. 284 B.] This description of death is far more philosophical than the notion of Aristotle, who makes it to consist in the corruption of natural heat; Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν ἅμα τό τε ζῆν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ θερμοῦ τούτου σωτηρίαν, καὶ τὸν καλούμενον θάνατον εἶναι τὴν τούτου φθοράν. *Lib. de Juvent. et Senect. cap.* 4. [§. 6.] inasmuch as the soul is not that natural heat, and the corruption of that heat followeth upon the separation of the soul.

25 This is expressed three ways, all signifying the separation of his soul from his body. St. Mark and St. Luke, ἐξέπνευσε, which is of the same force with ἐξέψυξε. But because ἐκψύχειν doth not always signify an absolute expiration, but sometimes a lipothymy only (as Hesychius, Ἐκψύχουσι, λειποθυμοῦσι· so Hippocrates useth it; Εἰσὶ δὲ ὀξύτατοι (καιροὶ) ὅσοις ἢ ἐκψύχουσι δεῖ τι ὠφελῆσαι. *De Morbis, lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [vol. vii. p. 533 E.] and again, Ἐκψύχουσι δὲ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν μετάστασιν ἐξαπίνης γινομένην), lest therefore we should take ἐξέπνευσε in such an imperfect sense, St. Matthew hath it, ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, and St. John παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Which is a full expression of the secession of the soul from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus, πνεύματος ἀπόστασις.

26 These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient philosophical subtilty, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The question was propounded thus, 'Quæsitum est, quando moriens moreretur, cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret.' Where Taurus admonisheth the rest, that this was no light question; for, says he, 'Gravissimi philosophorum super hac re serio quæsiverunt; et alii moriendi verbum atque momentum manente adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt;

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet farther illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an external violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the soul: the torments which he endured on the cross did bring him to that state, in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow.

For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin only excepted, had in his nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; and as to any extrinsical violence, able, according to the common course of nature, to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no natural preservative; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue its vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily die, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* For it was in his power whether he would come into the hands of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the cross; it was in his power to have come down from the cross, when he was nailed to it: but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying. John x. 18.

It is true that *Pilate marvelled* he was *dead so soon*, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to die by the accession of another pain: but we read not of such long Mark xv. 44.

213

alii nihil in eo tempore vitæ reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vindicaverunt.' The ancienter philosophers were divided; some saying a man died in the time of his life, others in the time of his death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to die while he is alive, nor when he is dead; 'et idcirco peperit ipse expressitque aliud quoddam novum in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὴν ἐξαίφνης φύσιν appellavit:' which he thus describes in his *Parmenides;* [p. 156 D.] Τὸ γὰρ ἐξαίφνης τοιόνδε τι ἔοικε σημαίνειν, ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον. So Aulus Gellius, *lib.* vi. *cap.* 13. Thus when our Saviour commended his soul into the hands of the Father, he was yet alive; when the soldier pierced his side, he was already dead: and the instant in which he gave up the ghost was the τὸ ἐξαίφνης when he died.

turrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they any such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though he Mark xv. 37. cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost? What though the centurion, when he saw it, said, Truly this man was the Son of God? The miracle was not in the death, but in the voice: the strangeness was not that he should die, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he died not by, but with, a miracle.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to exhaust his soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration, we might rationally say the Jews and Gentiles were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments, on which in time death must necessarily follow: but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas Acts ii. 23. St. Peter expressly chargeth his enemies, *Him ye have taken, and* v. 30. *by wicked hands have crucified and slain*; and again, *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree*[27]. Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the Jews authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion.

Wherefore being Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying: being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the ploughers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastened him to the cross; being these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghost*: it followeth that the only-begotten Son of God, the true Messias promised of old, did die a true and proper death. Which is the second conclusion in this explication.

But, thirdly, because Christ was not only man, but also God, and there was not only an union between his soul and body which he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and an union in his person; it will be farther necessary, for the understanding of his death, to shew what union was dissolved, what continued: that we may not make that separation either less or greater than it was.

[27] Acts ii. 23: v. 30. In both which places the original sheweth more expressly, that by their crucifixion they slew him: in the former thus Διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλετε. In the latter thus, Ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου.

Whereas then there were two different substantial unions in Christ, one of the parts of his human nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures, human and divine, by which it came to pass that God was man, and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already shewed, that the union of the parts of his human nature was dissolved on the cross, and a real separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of human nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But, secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the Divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second Person of the Trinity.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first, from the language of this very Creed[28]. For as we proved before, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceived*, and *born*, and *suffered*, and that the truth
214 of these propositions relied upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union: so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same Person, that he *was buried* and *descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church, that God died for us: which cannot be true, except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever subtract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinful demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended,

28 'Credimus certe non in solum Deum Patrem, sed et in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Modo totum dixi, in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Totum ibi intellige, et verbum, et animam, et carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est et sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas; et tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, ut ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro; et tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro.' *S. August. Tract.* 47. *in Joan.* [§. 12. vol. iii. part ii. p. 613 C]

and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

It is true, Christ cried upon the cross with a loud voice, saying, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But if that dereliction should signify a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life[29]. Whereas indeed those words infer no more than that he was bereft of such joys and comforts from the Deity, as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

Matt. xxvii. 46.

It remaineth therefore, that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered only an external violence; and what was subject to such corporal force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body failed the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporal or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word, therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either soul or body; but after it was made flesh[30], it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

Thus Christ did really and truly die, according to the condition of death to which the nature of man is subject: but although he was more than man, yet he died no more than man can die; a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoined one from another, but not from him that took them both together; rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united

29 Ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀνακράσεως εἰς τὴν θείαν φύσιν μετασκευάσαντος, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς κατὰ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας οὐ θατέρου μέρους τὸ ἅπαξ ἐγκραθὲν ἀνεχώρησεν· ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ χαρίσματα· ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἡ θεότης ἑκουσίως διέζευξεν, ἑαυτὴν δὲ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις μένουσαν ἔδειξε. *S. Greg. Nyss. de Christ. Resur. Orat.* I. [vol. iii. p. 392 D.]

30 This is the conclusion of St. Augustin, 'Ex quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, et susceptus est a Verbo homo, id est totus homo, anima et caro; quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? Animam vero a Verbo non separavit. Si enim mortuus est Dominus—sine dubio caro ipsius expiravit animam: ad tempus exiguum anima deseruit carnem, sed redeunte anima resurrecturam. A Verbo autem animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiso.* Fidelem latronis animam non deserebat, et deserebat suam? Absit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima posuit, et iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdissimus sensus est: non enim quæ a Verbo non erat separata, a seipsa poterat separari.' *Tract.* 47. *in Joan.* [§. 9. vol. iii. part ii. p. 611 F.]

after their separation[31]. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

215 The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential part of the mediatorship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the prophetical office, that Christ should die, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by this death. (He was *the true and faithful witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession.*) *This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood.* He preached unto us a new and *better covenant, which was established upon better promises,* and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the *blood of the new testament,* or *everlasting covenant:* for that covenant was also a testament; and *where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.* Beside, Christ, as a prophet, taught us not only by word, but by example: and though every action of his life, who came to fulfil the Law, be most worthy of our imitation; yet the most eminent example was in his death, in which he taught us great variety of Christian virtues. What an example was that of faith in God, *to lay down his life, that he might take it again;* in the bitterness of his torments to *commend his spirit into the hands of his Father;* and, *for the joy that was set before him, to endure the cross, and despise the shame?* What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for *the Son of Man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many;* to be *led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth;* to *endure the contradictions of sinners against himself,* and to *humble himself unto death, even the death of the cross?* What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God *to learn obedience by the things*

Rev. iii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 13. 1 John v. 6, 8. Heb. viii. 6. Matt. xxvi. 28. Luke xxii. 20. Heb. x. 29. xiii. 20. ix. 16. John x. 17. Luke xxiii. 46. Heb. xii. 2. Matt. xx. 28. Acts viii. 32. Heb. xii. 3. Phil. ii. 8. Heb. v. 8.

31 Ἐπεὶ διπλοῦν μὲν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σύγκραμα, ἁπλῆ δὲ καὶ μονοειδὴς ἡ τῆς θεότητος φύσις, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς διαζεύξεως, οὐ συνδιασχίζεται τῷ συνθέτῳ τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔμπαλιν γίνεται· τῇ γὰρ ἑνότητι τῆς θείας φύσεως, τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἴσον ἐν ἀμφοτέροις οὔσης, πάλιν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ διεστῶτα συμφύεται. *S. Greg. Nyss. de Christi Resur. Orat.* 1. [vol. iii. p. 393 B.] 'Tam velox incorruptæ carnis vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis; quoniam Deitas, quæ ab utraque suscepti hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit.' *Leo de Resur. Dom. Serm.* i. *cap.* 2. [vol. i. p. 304.]

Gal. iv. 4. *that he suffered;* to be *made under the Law,* and, though he never
Phil. ii. 8. broke the Law, *to become obedient unto death;* to go with cheer-
John xiv. 31. fulness to the cross upon this resolution, *as my Father gave me*
Rom. v. 8. *commandment, even so I do?* What exemplar of charity, to *die*
John xv. 13. *for us while we were yet sinners* and enemies, when *greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends;* to pray upon the cross for them that crucified him, and to apolo-
Luke xxiii. 34. gize for such as barbarously slew him; *Father, forgive them, for*
1 Pet. ii. 21. *they know not what they do?* Thus Christ did *suffer for us, leav-*
iv. 1, 2. *ing us an example that we should follow his steps;* that as he *suffered for us in the flesh,* we should *arm ourselves likewise with the same mind. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.* And so his death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his prophetical office.

Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should die, and by his
Heb. v. 1. death perform the sacerdotal office. *For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things* pertaining *to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.* But Christ
Heb. x. 4. had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins than himself. *For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away*
Heb. x. 8, 9. *sins:* and therefore when *sacrifice and offering* God *would not, then said* he, *Lo, I come to do thy will, O God;* then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices
Heb. ix. 22. of old were to be slain, and generally *without shedding of blood there is no remission;* therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin,
Isa. liii. 10. he must of necessity die, and so *make his soul an offering for sin.* If Christ be our Passover, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us must give his
1 Pet. i. 18, 19. life for our redemption: for we could *not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but* only *with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.* We 216
all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an act of that justice the sentence of death passed upon us: it was necessary therefore that Christ our surety should die, to satisfy the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sins, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must die who was to reconcile
Rom. v. 10. him to us. *For when we were enemies,* saith St. Paul, *we were*
Col. i. 21. *reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* We *were sometime*

alienated, and enemies in our mind by our *wicked works; yet now hath he reconciled* us *in the body of his flesh through death.* Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world: and not only for the act itself, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it, (*for if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead works?*) and of the happiness flowing from it; for *he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* Upon this assurance, founded on his death, we have the freedom and *boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.* Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect of us immediately for whom he died, but in reference to the Priest himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of himself, and consummation of his office. For *in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren: that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest,* and having *suffered, being tempted, might be able to succour them that are tempted:* so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the pains of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became, as an experimental Priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of, our temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his offering. For as the *high priest once every year* for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the Holy of Holies *not without blood;* so *Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.* And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect of his sacerdotal office.

Heb. ix. 13, 14.

Rom. viii. 32.

Heb. x. 19, 20.

Heb. ii. 17, 18.

Heb. ix. 7, 11, 12.

Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should die in reference to his regal office. *O king, live for ever,* is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal princes; either the expression of our desires, or the suggestion of their own: whereas our Christ never shewed more sovereign power than in his death,

Dan. iii. 9.

never obtained more than by his death. It was not for nothing that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintained what he
John xix. 21, 22. had written, *This is the King of the Jews.* That title on the cross did signify no less than that his regal power was active
Col. ii. 15. even there: for *having spoiled principalities and powers he made*
Heb. ii. 14. *a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it;* and *through* his *death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil.* Nor was his death only necessary for the present execution, but also for the assecution of farther power and
1 Pet. i. 11. dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. *The spirit of Christ* in the Prophets of old *testified beforehand the sufferings*
Ps. cx. 7. *of Christ, and the glory that should follow. He shall drink of the brook in the way,* saith the Prophet David; *therefore shall he lift*
Phil. ii. 8, 9. *up his head. He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death,* 217 *even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted*
Rom. xiv. 9. *him, and given him a name which is above every name. For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living.*

Thus it is necessary to believe and profess our faith in Christ who died: for by his blood and the virtue of his death was our redemption wrought, as by the price which was paid, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceived to express thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which *was dead:* I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental truth; That the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly die, so as, by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his Divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ which was crucified and *dead.*

And buried.

WHEN the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ

was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was laid up in the chambers of the grave: so that as we believe him *dead*, by the separation of his soul; we also believe him *buried* by the sepulture of his body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the Article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shewn, first, that the promised Messias was to be buried; and, secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messias was to be.

That the Messias was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to die among the Jews; because it was the universal custom of that nation to bury[32] their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their fathers' graves, yet public sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lie in: and not only they, but all the instruments which were used in the punishment were buried with them. And yet beside the general consequence of death among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for as that Prophet *was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so* was the Messias, or *the Son of Man,* to be *three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* Matt. xii. 40.

218 Nor was his burial only represented typically, but foretold prophetically, both by a suppositive intimation, and by an express prediction. The Psalmist intimated and supposed no less,

32 It is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman custom, 'Corpora condere, quam cremare, e more Ægyptio.' *Hist. lib.* v. *cap.* 5. As of the Egyptians by others, Θάπτουσι δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν, ταριχεύοντες· Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ, καίοντες· Παίονες δὲ, εἰς τὰς λίμνας ῥιπτοῦντες. *Diog. Laert. in Pyrrhonis Vit.* [lib. ix. §. 84.] But the Jews received this custom no more from the Egyptians than from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian ταρίχευσις; neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. Διελόμενοι κατὰ ἔθνη τὰς ταφὰς, ὁ μὲν Ἕλλην ἔκαυσεν· ὁ δὲ Πέρσης ἔθαψεν· ὁ δὲ Ἰνδὸς ὑάλῳ περιχρίει· ὁ δὲ Σκύθης κατεσθίει· ταριχεύει δὲ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος. *Lucian.* περὶ πένθους, §. 21. Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews received their custom of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham at the first purchased a buryingplace; yet it hath been observed, and is certainly true, that their general custom was to inter. Philo, one of their own writers, Ἀνθρώποις καὶ πᾶσι χερσαίοις οἰκειότερον ἡ φύσις χωρίον ἀπένειμε γῆν, οὐ μόνον ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανοῦσιν, ἵν' ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὑποδέχηται γένεσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ βίου τελευταίαν ἀνάλυσιν. *Lib. in Flaccum.* [vol. ii. p. 544.]

Ps. xvi. 9, 10. when, speaking in the person of the Christ, he said, *My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.* That *flesh* is there supposed only such, that is, a body dead[33]; and that body *resting* in the grave, the common habitation of the dead; yet *resting* there *in hope* that it should never *see corruption*, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrefy. Beside this intimation, there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the Messias in that eminent predic-

Isa. liii. 8, 9. tion of Isaiah; *He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.* For whatsoever the true interpretation of the prophecy be (of which we shall speak hereafter), it is certain that he which was to be *cut off*, was to have a *grave:* and being we have already shewn that he which was to be *cut off* was the Messias; it followeth, that by virtue of this prediction the promised Messias was to be buried.

Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenced by the Romans to die upon the cross, had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were exposed to the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field[34]; or if they escaped their

33 So the *Midrash Tillim* anciently expounded it, *My flesh shall rest in hope* לאחר מיתה *after death;* adding א' ר' יצחק מלמד שלא שלט בו רמה ותולעה *that Rabbi Isaac said, he taught by these words, that the moth and worm should have no power over him.* Whence, by the argument of St. Peter, it must be understood not of David; for his flesh saw corruption; nor of any other but the Messias. And although the Rabbins are wont to say, that the worms shall never eat the just, in opposition to the last words of Isaiah *; yet they must confess there is no difference in the grave; and therefore that worm must signify something else but the corruption of the body. Well therefore are those words paraphrased by Didymus, Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κατεσκήνωσεν ἡ σὰρξ, διὰ τὴν εὐθέως ἐσομένην ἀνάστασιν.

34 To this custom Horace alludes,

Non hominem occidi. Non pasces in cruce corvos.
Lib. i. Epist. 16. v. 48.

And Juvenal,

Vultur, jumento et canibus crucibusque relictis,
Ad fœtus properat, partemque cadaveris affert. Sat. xiv. v. 77.

So Prudentius,

——*Crux illum tollat in auras,*
Viventesque oculos offerat alitibus.
Περὶ στεφ. Hymn. xi. v. 65.

This punishment did appear in the mythology of Prometheus; who though he were by some represented simply as δεσμώτης, by others particularly he is described as ἀνεσταυρωμένος, especially by Lucian, who delivers him προσηλούμενον, κρεμάμενον, προσπατταλευόμενον, ἀνασταυρούμενον, ἀνασκολοπιζόμενον. And

[* Isa. lxvi. 24. *And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.*]

voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather[35]. A guard was also usually set about them[36], lest any pitying

Tertullian, speaking of Pontus, from whence Marcion came; 'Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illic nisi feritas calet; illa scilicet, quæ fabulas scenis dedit, de sacrificiis Taurorum, et amoribus Colchorum, et crucibus Caucasorum.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 1. [p. 366 A.] He touches the subject of three tragedies, Medea, Iphigenia in Tauris, and Prometheus Vinctus, or rather Crucifixus. As therefore the eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous rapacity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of them what Augustus once said; 'Uni suppliciter sepulturam precanti respondisse dicitur; *Jam istam in volucrum fore potestatem.*' *Suet. lib.* ii. *cap.* 13. Nor were they only in the power of the fowls of the air, as Prometheus was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him; *Οὔτε γὰρ ταπεινὸν καὶ πρόσγειον ἐσταυρῶσθαι χρή·* says Vulcan in Lucian for that reason; *Prometh. cap.* i. but ordinarily they hung so low upon the cross, that the ravenous beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes 'Patibuli cruciatum, cum canes et vultures intima protrahunt viscera.' *De Aur. Asin. lib.* vi.

35 So the bodies were often left upon the cross till the sun and rain had putrefied and consumed them. As when the daughter of Polycrates did see her father's fate in a dream, to be washed by Jupiter, and to be anointed by the sun, when he hung upon the cross it was performed. *Πολυκράτης δὲ ἀνακρεμάμενος ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς θυγατρός· ἐλοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς ὅκως ὕοι, ἐχρίετο δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀνιεὶς αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἰκμάδα. Herodot. lib.* iii. *cap.* 125. Of which Tertullian; 'Ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit de solis unguine et lavacro Jovis.' *De Anim. cap.* 46. [p. 298 C.] and which is farther thus expressed by Valerius Maximus: 'Putres ejus artus, et tabido cruore manantia membra, atque illam lævam, cui Neptunus annulum piscatoris manu restituerat, situ marcidam, Samos—lætis oculis aspexit.' *Lib.* vi. *cap.* 9. Thus were the bodies of the crucified left, 'ut in sublimi putrescerent.' 'Quid? Cyrenæum Theodorum, philosophum non ignobilem, nonne miramur? cui cum Lysimachus rex crucem minaretur, *Istis, quæso,* inquit, *ista horribilia minitare, purpuratis tuis: Theodori quidem nihil interest humine an sublime putrescat.*' *Cic. Tusc. Quæst. lib.* i. *cap.* 43. And so they perished, as the Scythians generally did, according to the description of Silius Italicus:

At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera truncis
Lenta dies sepelit, putri liquentia tabo.
Punic. lib. xiii. v. 486.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of those which were crucified was consumed; as Artemidorus observed, who concluded from thence, that it was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified: *Τοὺς δὲ πλουσίους βλάπτει· γυμνοὶ γὰρ σταυροῦνται, καὶ τὰς σάρκας ἀπολλύουσιν οἱ σταυρωθέντες. Oneirocr. lib.* ii. *cap.* 58.

36 As appeareth by that relation in Petronius Arbiter, [Satyr. cap. cxi.] 'Imperator provinciæ latrones jussit crucibus affigi—Proxima autem nocte, cum miles qui cruces asservabat ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraheret, &c.' And when that soldier was absent, 'Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut viderunt laxatam custodiam, detraxere nocte pendentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio.' Where we see the soldier set for a guard, and the end of that *custodia* (which the Greek lexicographers do not well confine to the *στράτευμα τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ ἐπικείμενον*), to keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastened to a cross (another example of the ignominy of this punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: *Ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὡς ἔγνω ταῦτα, προσέταξε τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ* Κλεομένους *κρεμάσαι καταβυρσώσαντας.* Where *κρεμάσαι* is again to be observed as taken for *ἀναστανρῶσαι*, for not long after in the same

hand should take the body from the cursed tree, and cover it with earth.

Under that custom of the Roman law was now the body of 219
our Saviour on the cross, and the guard was set; there was *the centurion and they that were with him, watching Jesus.* The centurion returned as soon as Christ was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death; but the watch continueth still. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfilled? How can this Jonas be conveyed into the belly of the whale? Where shall *he make his grave with the wicked,* or *with the rich, in his death* of crucifixion? By the providence of him who did foretel it, it shall be fulfilled. They which petitioned that he might be crucified, shall intercede that he may be interred. For the custom of the Jews required[37], that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the express words of Moses, *If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree; but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day.* Upon this general custom and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, *the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.* And this is the first step to the burial of our Saviour.

Matt. xxvii. 54.

Isa. liii. 9.

Deut. xxi. 22, 23.

John xix. 31.

For though, by the common rule of the Roman law, those which were condemned to the cross were to lose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or mourning[38]; yet it was in the power of the magistrate to in-

author it follows, Ὀλίγαις δ' ὕστερον ἡμέραις, οἱ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένους ἀνεσταυρωμένον παραφυλάττοντες εἶδον εὐμεγέθη δράκοντα τῇ κεφαλῇ περιπεπλεγμένον, καὶ ἀποκρύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ὥστε μηδὲν ὄρνεον ἐφίπτασθαι σαρκοφάγον. *Plutarch. in Vit. Cleom. cap.* 38, 39. [vol. i. p. 823.] where we see a guard set to keep him from burial; and the voracious fowls ready to seize on him, had they not been kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were soldiers, upon the crucifixion of any person, set as a guard, τὸν ἀνεσταυρωμένον παραφυλάττοντες, or τηροῦντες, 'et crucem asservantes,' viz. 'ne quis ad sepulturam corpus detraheret.'

37 מצות עשה לקבור את כל הרוגי בית דין ביום ההריגה : [præceptum legis est, ut omnes Synedrii damnati eodem in die sepeliantur.] *Maimon. Tract. Sanhed. cap.* 15. So Josephus, Τοσαύτην Ἰουδαίων περὶ τὰς ταφὰς πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἐκ καταδίκης ἀνασταυρουμένους πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν τε καὶ θάπτειν. *De Bell. Jud. lib.* iv. *cap.* 18. [c. 5. §. 2.]

38 'Non solent autem lugeri (ut Neratius ait) hostes, vel perduellionis damnati, nec suspendiosi, nec qui manus

dulge the leave of burial[39]: and therefore Pilate, who crucified Christ only because the Jews desired it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it; he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Now though the Jews had obtained their request of Pilate, though Christ had been thereby certainly buried; yet had not the prediction been fulfilled, which expressly mentioned the *rich in his death*. For as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he been buried with them, because by the Jews there was appointed a public place of burial for all such as suffered as malefactors.

Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caused his crucifixion, *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just; who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews:* Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. John xix.
220 this *Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought* him *that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered: he came therefore and took the body of Jesus.*

Beside, *there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a master of Israel;* this *Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.* John iii. 1, 10: xix. 39, 40.

And thus was the burial of the Son of God performed, according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable: first, what was done to the body, to prepare it for the grave; secondly, how the sepulchre was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the

sibi intulerunt, non tædio vitæ, sed mala conscientia.' *Digest. lib.* iii. *tit.* 2. *l. Liberorum.*

39 So Ulpianus, 'Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt: et id se observasse etiam Divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur, quam si fuerit petitum et permissum; et nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum.' *Lib.* ix. *de Officio Proconsulis.* So Paulus, *lib.* i. *Sententiarum:* 'Corpora animadversorum quibuslibet petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subjectos sepulturæ tradi non vetamus.' *Cod. lib.* iii. *tit.* 43. *l.* 11.

persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfil the prophecy.

As for fulfilling the custom of the Jews as to the preparation in respect to his body, we find the *spices* and the *linen clothes*. Mark xiv. 3, 8. When *there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box and poured it on his head;* Christ made this interpretation of that action, *she is come beforehand to anoint my body to the burying.* When Christ Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiv. 1. was risen, *Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the spices which they had prepared, that they might come and anoint him.* Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the spices which Nicodemus brought. The custom of wrapping in the linen John xi. 44. clothes we see in Lazarus rising from the grave; for *he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin.* In the same manner when our Saviour was John xx. 6, 7. risen, *Simon Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.* Thus, according to the custom of the Jews, was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes[40] with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.

40 There are four words in the Gospel expressing the linen clothes in which the dead were buried, σινδών, ὀθόνια, κειρίαι, and σουδάριον. The Σινδών is used by three Evangelists, as what was brought by Joseph: Καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα, καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸν, ἐνείλησε τῇ σινδόνι. Mark xv. 46. and St. Matthew and St. Luke, Ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι. Matt. xxvii. 59. Luke xxiii. 53. Ὀθόνια is used by St. John; Ἔλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις. xix. 40. [and St. Luke, βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα. xxiv. 12.] Now both these words shew that the clothes were linen. Σινδών, *tunica linea, Gloss.* Φωσσώνιον, λινοῦν τι, ἤτοι σινδόνιον. *Etym.* So Ὀθόνια, λινᾶ ἱμάτια. *Hesych.* This was according to the custom of the Jews, amongst whom there was a kind of law, that they should use no other grave-clothes. As therefore the Egyptians in Herodotus, *lib.* ii. *cap.* 86. Λούσαντες τὸν νεκρὸν, κατειλίσσουσι πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδόνος βυσσίνης, so the Jews. But it is farther to be observed, that St. John saith, Ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις, they bound up his body with several clothes, which signifies it was done *fasciatim.* As Herodotus in another case, Σμύρνησί τε ἰώμενοι τὰ ἕλκεα, καὶ σινδόνος βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι κατειλίσσοντες. *Lib.* vii. *cap.* 181. Whereas then Julius Pollux observes, Εἴρηται δέ που καὶ τελαμὼν σινδονίτης, *lib.* vii. *cap.* 16. *segm.* 72, I conceive these ὀθόνια in St. John were such τελαμῶνες σινδονῖται, *lineæ fasciæ*, or *institæ*, called in the case of Lazarus κειρίαι, St. John xi. 44. for as he is described δεδεμένος κειρίαις, so it is said of the body of Christ, Ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις, *They bound him with linen bandages* or *swathes.* These are the ἐντάφια δεσμά, as the grammarians interpret κειρία *tanquam* κηρία. So the ancient MS. in the library at St. James's reads it, Δεδεμένος τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας κηρίαις. And so Hesychius read it, when he made that interpretation; Κειρίαις (leg. Κηρίαις) ἐπιθανάτια ἐντετυλιγμένα. What anciently κειρία was, will appear by the words of Julius Pol-

221 As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually

lux: Καὶ μὴν τόγε τῇ κλινῇ ἢ τῷ σκίμποδι ἐντεταμένον, ὡς φέρειν τὰ τυλεῖα, σπαρτία, σπάρτα, τόνος, κειρία· *lib.* x. *cap.* 7. *segm.* 36. the bands or cords by which the beds or couches are fastened, and upon which the bedding lies. In this sense it is to be taken in that known place of Aristophanes, *in Avibus, v.* 816.

Σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θείμην ἐγὼ τῇ 'μῇ πόλει;

Οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνῃ πάνυγε κειρίαν ἔχων;

Of which Eustathius, *Il.* β'. [v. 135.] gives us this account: Φησὶ μὴ ἂν δεηθῆναι σπάρτης, κειρίαν ἔχων· ἤτοι μὴ δεηθῆναι σπαρτίνου πλέγματος, ἐὰν ἄλλην ἔχοι κειρίαν, ἤτοι δεσμὸν κλίνης. Hence the grammarians give that interpretation of κειρία. As Etymologus, Κειρία, σημαίνει τὸ σχοινίον τὸ δεσμεῦον τὴν κλίνην, viz. in reference to that place of Aristophanes, otherwise it hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently signifieth any fascia or band. So the Scholiast of Aristophanes; Ἡ δὲ κειρία, εἶδος ζώνης ἐκ σχοινίων παρεοικὸς ἱμάντι, ᾗ δεσμοῦσι τὰς κλίνας, not the cord of a bed, but a fascia or girdle like unto it. With such linen fasciæ, swathes or bandages, was the body of Lazarus involved:

——— Ἐκ ποδὸς ἄχρι καρήνου
Σφιγγόμενον πλεκτῇσιν ὅλον δέμας εἶχε κερείαις,

says Nonnus [xi. v. 169.]: and Juvencus,

Nec mora: connexis manibus pedibusque repente
Procedit tumulo, vultum cui linea texta,
Et totum gracilis connectit fascia corpus.

De Evang. Hist. lib. iv. [p. 20 B.] Hence Basil bishop of Seleucia makes Lazarus come out of the grave to life like an infant in swaddling-clothes: Ἐκεῖθεν ἀνεπήδα νεκρὸς τετραήμερος τὰ τοῦ θανάτου περικείμενος σύμβολα· καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἀποδυσάμενος, τὴν τοῦ τάφου στολὴν οὐκ ἠλλάξατο· ἀλλ' ἐφίστατο ταῖς κειρί'αις [κηρείαις] ὡς ἐκ τάφου τεχθείς, καὶ μετὰ τόκον φέρων τὰ σπάργανα. *Orat.* 35. *in Publican. et Pharis.* [p. 181 B.] The κειρίαι then were *institæ*, as the Vulgar Latin; *fasciæ*, as Juvencus and the Syriac translation, אסיר בפסקיתא *vinctus fasciis.* Of the same nature I conceive were the ὀθόνια mentioned in our Saviour's burial; and so St. Augustin does express them in reconciling the rest of the Evangelists, who mentioned only Joseph and the *sindon*, with St. John, who addeth Nicodemus and the ὀθόνια: 'Neque hic aliquid repugnat recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt a solo Josepho Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone a Josepho involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi et alia lintea potuisse afferri a Nicodemo et superaddi: ut verum narraret Joannes, quod non uno linteo, sed linteis involutus sit; quamvis et propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, et institas quibus corpus totum alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiamsi una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, *ligaverunt eum linteis.*' *De consensu Evang. lib.* iii. *cap.* 23. [§. 60. vol. iii. part ii. p. 132 F.] These which he calls 'institæ quibus totum corpus alligatum est,' were the תכריכי המת *involucra mortui.* Beside these, we read in the history of Lazarus, Ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο, John xi. 44. and of our Saviour, Καὶ τὸ σουδάριον ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ. St. John xx. 7. The same is rendered by the Syriac סודרא, and Nonnus makes it a Syriac word:

Καὶ λινέῳ πεπύκαστο καλύμματι κυκλάδα κόρσην,
Σουδάριον τό περ εἶπε Σύρων στόμα·——
Paraphr. cap. 11. [v. 172.]

Whereas the word is not a Syriac, but Latin origination; and from the Latins came to the Greek and Eastern people: *Sudor* and *Sudare*, from thence *Sudarium.* 'Vatinius reus, agente in eum Calvo, candido frontem sudario detersit.' *Quintil. Inst. Orator. lib.* vi. *cap.* 3. Suetonius of Nero, 'Plerumque —ligato circa collum sudario, prodiit in publicum.' *lib.* vi. *cap.* 51. This was translated into their own language by the later Greeks, to signify that which

observed in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepared a place of burial for himself, and the manner of it is expressed: for *in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewn out of the rock for his own tomb: there laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre.* And so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth[41], and

Matt. xxvii. 60. Mark xv. 46. John xix. 41.

before was called ἡμιτύβιον and καψιδρώτιον, as is observed by Julius Pollux, *lib.* vii. *cap.* 16. *segm.* 71. Τὸ δὲ ἡμιτύβιον, ἔστι μὲν καὶ τοῦτο Αἰγύπτιον, εἴη δ' ἂν κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κωμῳδίᾳ καψιδρώτιον καλούμενον, ὃ νῦν σουδάριον ὀνομάζεται. Ἀριστοφάνει γὰρ ἐν Πλούτῳ τοιαύτη τις ἡ δόξα,

Ἔπειτα καθαρὸν ἡμιτύβιον λαβὼν,
Τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησε ———

Plut. v. 729.

where τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησε is the same with that in Quintilian, *frontem detersit*; ἡμιτύβιον then was the same with *sudarium*; so the Scholiast upon that place: Ἡμιτύβιον ῥάκος ἡμιτριβὲς, λινοῦν τι, οἷον ἐκμαγεῖον. This is the proper signification of Σουδάριον, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriac language, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use: as Ruth iii. 15. *Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee;* the Chaldee rendereth it הבי סודרא די עליך, and it held six measures of barley: so when Moses is said to *put a veil on his face*, Exod. xxxiv. 33. the Chaldee again rendereth it, ויהב על איקונין דבית אנפוי סודרא *Targ. Jonath.* So the Rabbins ordinarily use, סודרא על רישיה *the veil or covering of his head:* and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the etymology, as Nonnus conceived in those words,

Θερμὸν ἔχων ἱδρῶτα καλυπτομένοιο προσώπου.

as if Lazarus had come sweating out of his grave; but only to the use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Martialis calls 'sudarium mortuorum.' *Epist. ad Tholos. cap.* 1.

41 Strabo observeth of Jerusalem, that the ground about it ἐντὸς ἑξήκοντα σταδίων, was ὑπόπετρος, *for nine miles rocky underneath. Lib.* xvi. [§. 36.] It is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was *petrosa*. It is said therefore of Joseph, that μνημεῖον ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ· St. Matt. xxvii. 60. of the sepulchre, that ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, St. Mark xv. 46. and λαξευτόν, St. Luke xxiii. 53. which signify no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus [xix. v. 215] makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of λαξευτόν only;

——— Ἦεν δ' ἐνὶ γείτονι κήπῳ
Τύμβος ἀδωμήτοιο βαθυνομένης ἀπὸ πέτρης
Γλυπτὸς ὅλος, νεότευκτος.———

where βαθυνομένης signifies the excavation of the rock, and γλυπτός the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or exsculption. But Salmasius hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art, of stone, within it. And this interpretation he endeavours to prove out of the text; first alleging that πέτρα signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock, and therefore λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας is ἐκ λίθου, *made of stone:* otherwise the article would have been added, ἐκ τῆς πέτρας, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in St. Matthew the article is expressly added, Ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ. St. Matthew therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again, he objects that λατομεῖν signifies not only *lapides ex lapicidina cædere*, but also *polire et quadrare ad ædificandum;* and λαξεύειν signifies the last only. Wherefore being

that vault secured from external injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was performed, and
222 the sepulture completed: so that it was not lawful by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre[42], or disturb the interred body.

it is said not only λελατομημένον, which may be understood of building, but also λαξευτόν, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes, that it was a vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of λαξεύειν, which may be extended to any sense of λατομεῖν (as Origen indifferently,—λατομητὸν ἢ λαξευτὸν μνημεῖον ἐν πέτρᾳ, *Cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [p. 439 B.]), and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custom, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custom, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word חצב by λατσμεῖν, as 1 Kings v. 29. חצב בהר Λατόμων ἐν τῷ ὄρει. Isa. li. 1. הביטו אל-צור חצבתם, Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν, ἣν ἐλατομήσατε, *unde excisi.* As therefore Deut. vi. 11. Λάκκους λελατομημένους οὓς οὐκ ἐξελατόμησας, so Isa. xxii. 16. Ὅτι ἐλατόμησας σεαυτῷ ὧδε μνημεῖον—καὶ ἔγραψας σεαυτῷ ἐν πέτρᾳ σκηνήν: in both places λατομεῖν is nothing else but חצב, and there μνημεῖον λελατομημένον, in the language of the Jews, is to be taken in the same sense with λάκκος λελατομημένος, that is, digged or hewn out of the ground. This is well expressed by Origen; Ἡ ταφὴ ἔχει τὴν καθαρότητα διὰ τοῦ συμβολικοῦ δηλουμένην ἐν τῷ ἀποτεθεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν μνημείῳ καινῷ ὑφεστῶτι, οὐκ ἐκ λογάδων λίθων οἰκοδομηθέντι, καὶ τὴν ἕνωσιν οὐ φυσικὴν ἔχοντι, ἀλλ' ἐν μιᾷ καὶ δι' ὅλων ἡνωμένῃ πέτρᾳ λατομητῇ καὶ λαξευτῇ. *Cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [c. 69. p. 439 D.] And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very material in the opinion of St. Jerom, who makes this observation on Matt. xxvii. [vol. vii. p. 240 C.] 'In monumento novo, quod excisum fuerat in petra, conditus est; ne si ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatus furto diceretur;' and gives this interpretation of the Prophet Isaiah, 'Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus esset, Prophetæ testimonium est dicentis, *Hic habitabit in excisa spelunca petræ fortissimæ;* statimque post duos versiculos sequitur, *Regem cum gloria videbitis.*' Another use of the same supposition is made likewise by St. Ambrose; 'Domini corpus tanquam per Apostolorum doctrinam infertur in vacuam et in novam requiem lapidis excisi; scilicet in pectus duritiæ gentilis quodam doctrinæ opere excisum Christus infertur, rude scilicet ac novum, et nullo antea ingressu timoris Dei pervium.' *In Matt. cap.* 27. Thus was the sepulchre prepared for the body: and when Joseph had laid it there, προσεκύλισε λίθον μέγαν πρὸς τὴν θύραν, *he rolled a great stone to the door*, St. Matt. xxvii. 60. the last part of that solemnity. For this great stone was said to be rolled, by reason of the bigness, as being not portable, (from whence arose the women's doubt, Mark xvi. 3. *Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?*) and that very properly, for it had its name from that rolling, being called constantly by the Jews גולל or גוללא, from גלל *volvere.* הגולל אבן גדולה ורחבה שסותמים בה פי הקבר מלמעלה מלשון וגללו את האבן *Obadias de Bartenora.*

42 This hath been observed by the Jews themselves, אסור לפתוח הקבר אחר שנסתם הגולל *It is prohibited for any man to open the sepulchre after it is shut with the rolled stone**.

* [This and the preceding passage may be found in Buxtorf's Rabbinic Lexicon under גולל. The former he thus translates, "גולל is a large and broad stone, with which they cover over the mouth of the sepulchre, according to the phrase in Gen. xxix. 3. And they rolled the stone." R. P. S.]

Thirdly, two eminent persons did concur unto the burial of our Saviour, a ruler and a counsellor[43], men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people; Joseph of Arimathea, rich and honourable, and yet inferior to Nicodemus, one of the great council of the Sanhedrim: these two, though fearful while he lived to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of Providence to inter him; that so the prediction might be fulfilled, which was delivered by Isaiah to this purpose. The counsel of his enemies, the design of the Jews, *made his grave with the wicked*, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him: but *because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth;* because he was no ways guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered; that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsel of his Father, the design of Heaven, put him *with the rich in his death*, and caused a counsellor and a ruler of the Jews to bury him.

Isa. liii. 9.

The necessity of this part of the Article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth, both of Christ's death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they die: Pilate was very inquisitive whether our Saviour *had been any while dead*, and was fully satisfied by the centurion, before he would *give the body to Joseph* to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never died; nor can there be a true resurrection, where there hath not been a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he died: and a greater assurance of his death than this we cannot have, that his body was delivered by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Mark xv. 44, 45.

Secondly, a profession to believe that Christ *was buried* is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his burial. For we are *buried with him in baptism*, even *buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.* That nothing may be

Col. ii. 12. Rom. vi. 4.

[43] So they are styled in the Scriptures, Joseph, βουλευτής, and Nicodemus, ἄρχων: and these two powers ruled all then at Jerusalem under the Romans. As appeared when Agrippa prevented a war by the sudden raising of a tax: Εἰς δὲ τὰς κώμας οἵ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταὶ μερισθέντες τοὺς φόρους συνέλεγον. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib.* ii. *cap.* 29. [c. xvii. §. 1.]

done or suffered by our Saviour in these great transactions of the Mediator, but may be acted in our souls, and represented in our spirits[44].

223 Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his Disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be received and given at their funerals. When Ananias died, though for his sin, yet they *wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him:* Acts v. 6. when Stephen was stoned, *devout men carried him* to his burial, Acts viii. 2. *and made great lamentation over him:* and when Dorcas died, they *washed* her, and *laid* her *in an upper chamber:* so careful Acts ix. 37. were the primitive Christians of the rites of burial. Before, and at our Saviour's time, the Greeks did much, the Romans more, use the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reserved only their ashes in their urns: but when Christianity began to increase, the funeral flames did cease, and after a few emperors had received baptism, there was not a body burnt in all the Roman empire[45]. For the first Christians wholly abstained

44 'Quicquid gestum est in cruce Christi, in sepultura, in resurrectione tertio die, in ascensione in cœlum, in sede ad dextram Patris, ita gestum est, ut his rebus, non mystice tantum dictis, sed etiam gestis, configuraretur vita Christiana quæ hic geritur. Nam propter ejus crucem dictum est, *Qui autem Jesu Christi sunt, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis et concupiscentiis;* propter sepulturam, *Consepulti sumus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem;* propter resurrectionem, *Ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit a mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita et nos in novitate vitæ ambulemus;* propter ascensionem in cœlum, sedemque ad dextram Patris, *Si autem resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt quærite, ubi Christus est ad dextram Dei sedens.*' *S. August. Enchirid. ad Laur. cap.* 53. [vol. vi. p. 216 D.] And this was before observed by Origen; Τὰ συμβεβηκέναι ἀναγεγραμμένα τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐκ ἐν ψιλῇ τῇ λέξει καὶ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τὴν πᾶσαν ἔχει θεωρίαν τῆς ἀληθείας. Ἕκαστον γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ σύμβολόν τινος εἶναι παρὰ τοῖς συνετώτερον ἐντυγχάνουσι τῇ γραφῇ ἀποδείκνυται. Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν ἔχει τὴν δηλουμένην ἀλήθειαν ἐν τῷ, Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, καὶ τῷ σημαινομένῳ ἐκ τοῦ, Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. καὶ ὁ θάνατος αὐτοῦ ἀναγκαῖος, διὰ τὸ, Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· καὶ διὰ τὸ τὸν δίκαιον λέγειν, Συμμορφούμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ, Εἰ συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ συζήσομεν· οὕτω καὶ ἡ ταφὴ αὐτοῦ φθάνει ἐπὶ τοὺς συμμόρφους τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς συσταυρωθέντας αὐτῷ καὶ συναποθανόντας, καθὸ καὶ τῷ Παύλῳ λέλεκται τό, Συνετάφημεν γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ συνανέστημεν αὐτῷ. *Cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [c. 69. p. 438 D.]

45 This appeareth by Macrobius, who lived in the time of Theodosius junior, and testifieth thus much; 'Licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro seculo nullus sit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni dari honor mortuis habebatur, &c.' *Saturnal. lib.* vii. *cap.* 7. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the heathens anciently did object it to the Christians. 'Inde videlicet et execrantur rogos, et damnant ignium sepulturas.' And the answer given to this objection was, 'Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum sepulturæ timemus, sed veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus.'

from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral, making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of Arabia in their graves[46]. The description of the persons which interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for his burial, have been thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians[47]. For as natural reason will teach us to give some kind of respect unto the bodies of men, though dead, in reference to the souls which formerly inhabited them[48]: so, and much more, the followers of our
1 Cor. vi. 19. Saviour, while they looked upon our bodies living as *temples of*

Minuc. Felix in Octavio, cap. 11. *et* 34. And Tertullian; 'Et hoc enim in opinione quorundam est; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aiunt, parcentes superfluo animæ. Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquiis animæ adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aversatrix, quod et ipsum homo non utique mereatur pœnali exitu impendi.' *De Anim. cap.* 51. [p. 301 C.] 'At ego magis ridebo vulgus, tunc quoque quum ipsos defunctos atrocissime exurit, quos postmodum gulosissime nutrit, iisdem ignibus et promerens et offendens. O pietatem de crudelitate ludentem! sacrificat, an insultat, quum crematis cremat? *Idem, de Resur. Carn. cap.* 1. [p. 325 A.]

46 The Heathens objected it to the primitive Christians; 'Reservatis unguenta funeribus.' *Minuc. Felix in Octavio, cap.* 12. And Tertullian confesseth it, 'Thura plane non emimus. Si Arabiæ queruntur, scient Sabæi pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam diis fumigandis.' *Apologet. cap.* 42. [p. 34 B.] And speaking of spices; 'Etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulturæ usui sunt.' *De Idololat. cap.* 11. [p. 91 C.] So Clemens Alexandrinus: Μυρίζονται γὰρ οἱ νεκροί· and again, Αἱ γὰρ ὑπέρμετροι χρίσεις τῶν μύρων κηδείας, οὐ συμβιώσεως ἀποπνέουσιν. *Pæd. lib.* ii. *cap.* 8. [vol. i. p. 205.]

47 'Ipse Dominus die tertio resurrecturus religiosæ mulieris bonum opus prædicat, prædicandumque commendat, quod unguentum pretiosum super membra ejus effuderit, atque hoc ad eum sepeliendum fecerit. Et laudabiliter commemorantur in Evangelio, qui corpus ejus de cruce acceptum diligenter atque honorifice tegendum sepeliendumque curarunt. Verum istæ auctoritates non hoc admonent, quod insit ullus cadaveribus sensus: sed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia, corpora quoque mortuorum pertinere significant, propter fidem resurrectionis astruendam.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* i. *cap.* 13. [vol. vii. p. 14 B.]

48 Οὐδὲν δὲ—λυπεῖ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ τὸ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλείτου λεγόμενον, ὅπερ Κέλσος παρείληφεν, ὅτι νέκυές εἰσι κυπρίων ἐκβλητότεροι· καίτοι γε εἴποί τις ἂν καὶ περὶ τούτου, ὅτι τὰ μὲν κόπρια ἐκβλητά ἐστιν, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἀνθρώπου νέκυες διὰ τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ψυχήν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν ᾖ ἀστειοτέρα, οὐκ ἐκβλητοί. Κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς ἀστειοτέρους τῶν νόμων, μετὰ τῆς ἐνδεχομένης ὡς πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα τιμῆς, ταφῆς ἀξιοῦνται· ἵνα μὴ ὑβρίζωμεν τῇ δυνάμει τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ψυχήν, ἀπορριπτοῦντες μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἐκείνην τὸ σῶμα, ὡς καὶ τὰ τῶν κτηνῶν σώματα. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* v. [c. 24. p. 595 E.]

———Νεμεσσῶμαί γε μὲν οὐδὲν
Κλαίειν ὅς κε θάνῃσι βροτῶν καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπῃ.
Τοὔτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἷον ὀϊζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι,
Κείρασθαί τε κόμην βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ παρειῶν. Ὀδ. δ'. 195.

the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no ways to be
224 neglected after death[49], but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave, with such due respect as might become the honour of the dead, and comfort of the living. And this decent custom of the primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most effectual in the conversion of the heathens and propagation of the Gospel[50].

Thus I believe the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation, deposited in a sepulchre hewn

[49] 'Nec ideo tamen contemnenda et abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tanquam organis et vasis ad omnia bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis et annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi, tanto charius est posteris, quanto erga parentes major affectus; nullo modo ipsa spernenda sunt corpora, quæ utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam quælibet indumenta gestamus. Hæc enim non ad ornamentum vel adjutorium, quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsam naturam hominis, pertinent.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* i. *cap.* 13. [vol. vii. p. 13 F.] Ταῦτα τελέσας ὁ ἱεράρχης, ἀποτίθησιν ἐν οἴκῳ τιμίῳ τὸ σῶμα, μεθ' ἑτέρων ὁμοταγῶν ἱερῶν σωμάτων. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι τὴν θεοφιλῆ ζωὴν ὁ κεκοιμημένος ἐβίῳ, τίμιον ἔσται· μετὰ τῆς ὁσίας ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ συναθλῆσαν αὐτῇ σῶμα κατὰ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἱδρῶτας, ἔνθεν ἡ θεία δικαιοσύνη μετὰ τοῦ σφετέρου σώματος αὐτῇ δωρεῖται τὰς ἀμοιβαίας λήξεις, ὡς ὁμοπορεύτῳ καὶ συμμετόχῳ τῆς ὁσίας ἡ τῆς ἐναντίας ζωῆς. *Dionys. Eccl. Hierarch. cap.* 7. [p. 150 C.] 'Propter patrem militiam Christi deseram, cui sepulturam Christi causa non debeo, quam etiam omnibus ejus causa debeo?' *S. Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodor. de Laude Vit. Solitar. cap.* 3. [Epist. XIV. vol. i. p. 30 A.]

[50] This was observed by Julian the Apostate, who, writing to an idolatrous high priest, puts him in mind of those things by which he thought the Christians gained upon the world, and recommends them to the practice of the heathen priests. Of these he reckons three; the gravity of their carriage, their kindness to strangers, and their care for the burial of the dead. Τί οὖν ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα ταῦτα ἀρκεῖν, οὐδ' ἀποβλέπομεν ὃ μάλιστα τὴν ἀθεότητα (so he calls Christianity, because they rejected all the heathen gods) συνηύξησεν, ἡ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία, καὶ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν νεκρῶν προμήθεια, καὶ ἡ πεπλασμένη σεμνότης κατὰ τὸν βίον; ὧν ἕκαστον οἶομαι χρῆναι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι. *Epist.* 49. *ad Arsacium.* [p. 429 D.] And as Julian observed the care of burial as a great encouragement to the heathens to turn Christians, so Gregory Nazianzen did observe the same to the great dishonour of the Apostate, comparing his funeral with his predecessor's. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (that is Constantius) παραπέμπεται πανδήμοις εὐφημίαις τε καὶ πομπαῖς, καὶ τούτοις δὲ τοῖς ἡμετέροις σεμνοῖς, ᾠδαῖς πανύχοις καὶ δᾳδουχίαις, αἷς Χριστιανοὶ τιμᾶν μετάστασιν εὐσεβῆ νομίζομεν· καὶ γίνεται πανήγυρις μετὰ πάθους, ἡ ἐκκομιδὴ τοῦ σώματος. But as for Julian, Μῖμοι γελοίων ἦγον αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς αἴσχεσιν ἐπομπεύετο—ἕως ἡ Ταρσέων αὐτὸν ὑποδέχεται πόλις——ἔνθα δὲ οἱ τέμενος ἄτιμον, καὶ τάφος ἐξάγιστος, καὶ ναὸς ἀπόπτυστος, καὶ οὐδὲ θεατὸς εὐσεβῶν ὄψεσι. *Orat. in Julian.* 2. [Orat. v. §. 16, 18. pp. 157–159.]

out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by the rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ *was buried.*

ARTICLE V.

225

He descended into Hell: the third day he rose again from the dead.

THE former part of this Article, of the descent into hell, hath not been so anciently in the Creed[51], or so universally, as the

51 First, it is to be observed, that the Descent into Hell was not in the ancient Creeds or rules of Faith. Some tell us that it was not in the Confession of Ignatius. *Epist. ad Magnes.* But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that Epistle; for what is read there, was thrust in out of Clemens's Constitutions. In the like manner, in vain is it objected that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clemens Romanus, and Justin Martyr, because they have not pretended any rule of Faith or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, it is not to be found in the rules of Faith delivered by Irenæus, *lib.* i. cap. 2. [c. 10.] by Origen, *lib.* περὶ ἀρχῶν, *in Procem.* or by Tertullian, *Adv. Prax. cap.* 2. *De Virg. veland. cap.* 1. *De Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap.* 13. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles' Creed: not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan; not in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the Council of Nice, *Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 37.] not in that of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, delivered to Pope Julius, *Epiphan. Hæres.* lxxii. §. 10. not in that of Arius and Euzoius, presented to Constantine, *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [p. 61.] not in that of Acacius bishop of Cæsarea, delivered into the Synod of Seleucia, *Socrat. lib.* ii. *cap.* 40. [p. 151.] not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liberius, *Socrat. lib.* iv. *cap.* 12. There is no mention of it in the Creed of St. Basil, *Tract. de Fide in Asceticis;* in the Creed of Epiphanius, *in Ancorato,* §. 120.* [vol. ii. p. 122.] Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by St. Cyril (though some have produced that Creed to prove it)†; it is not in the Creed expounded by St. Augustin, *De Fide et Symbolo;* not in that *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos,* attributed to St. Augustin; not in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch, delivered by Cassianus, *De Incarn. lib.* vi. [c. 3.] neither is it to be seen in the MS. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed it is affirmed by Ruffinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental

* [But Epiphanius seems to have heard of the doctrine, since he speaks of τῆς θεότητος συγκατελθούσης τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια. *Anaceph.* 9. vol. ii. p. 155 B.]

† [Though the clause is not in the Creed, Cyril says of Christ, κατῆλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, (Cat. IV. 11. p. 57 B.) and ἐξεπλάγη ὁ θάνατος θεωρήσας καινόν τινα κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδην. Cat. XIV. 19. p. 214 B.) It is probable therefore that Ruffinus spoke of the public creeds, which were recited at baptism. See King on the Creed, p. 246.]

rest. The first place we find it used in was the Church of Aquileia; and the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was less than four hundred years after Christ. After that it came into the Roman Creed[52], and others[53], and hath been acknowledged as a part of the Apostles' Creed ever since.

Indeed the descent into hell hath always been accepted[54], but with a various exposition: and the Church of England at the Reformation, as it received the three Creeds, in two of which this Article is contained, so did it also make this one of the Articles of Religion, to which all who are admitted to any benefice, or received into holy orders, are obliged to subscribe. And at the first reception it was propounded with a certain explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King Edward the Sixth, with reference to an express place of Scripture interpreted of this descent: *That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection: but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth*[55]. So likewise after the same manner in the Creed set forth in metre after the manner of a

1 Pet. iii. 19.

Creeds; 'Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, *descendit ad inferna;* sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 18. p. ccxii.] It is certain therefore (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity), that the article of the Descent into Hell was not in the Roman, or any of the Oriental Creeds.*

52 That the Descent into Hell came afterwards into the Roman Creed appeareth, not only because we find it there of late, but because we find it often in the Latin Church many ages since: as in that produced by Etherius against Elipandus in the year 785; in the 115th Sermon *de Tempore*, falsely ascribed to St. Augustin, where it is attributed to St. Thomas the Apostle; in the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

53 As in the Creed attributed to St. Athanasius, which though we cannot say was his, yet we know was extant about the year 600, by the epistle of Isidorus Hispalensis *ad Claudium Ducem.* It was also inserted into the Creed of the Council of Ariminum, [A.D. 359.] *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 37. and of the fourth Council of Toledo, held in the year 633; and of the sixteenth Council of the same Toledo, held in the year 693.

54 'Quis nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud Inferos Christum?' *S. August. Epist.* xcix. *cap.* 2. §. 3. [al. Ep. clxiv. vol. ii. p. 574 C.]

55 'Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in Inferno detinebantur fuit, illisque prædicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus, &c.' *Articuli an.* 1552. Which place was also made use of in the Exposition of the Creed contained in the Catechism set forth by the authority of King Edward, in the seventh year of his reign.

* [Concerning this clause, see King's *Critical History of the Apostles' Creed*, c. iv. Grabe in Bulli *Jud. Eccl. Cath.* ad c. iv, v, et vi. §. 12. Lavater, *de Descensu Jesu Christi ad inferos.*]

Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this staff:

> And so he died in the flesh,
> But quickened in the spirit:
> His body then was buried,
> As is our use and right.
>
> His spirit did after this descend
> Into the lower parts,
> Of them that long in darkness were
> The true light of their hearts.

226

But in the Synod ten years after, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the Articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same descent, but without any the least explication, or reference to any particular place of Scripture, in these words: *As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell.* Wherefore being our Church hath not now imposed that interpretation of St. Peter's words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the only place of Scripture to found the descent into hell upon; being it hath alleged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it: we may with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgment in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

Article III. 1562.

First then, it is to be observed, that as this Article was first in the Aquileian Creed, so it was delivered there not in the express and formal term of *hell*, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, *descendit in inferna:* which words as they were continued in other Creeds[56], so did they find a double interpretation among the Greeks; some translating *inferna, hell;* others, the *lower parts*[57]: the first with relation to

[56] 'Descendit in Inferna,' or 'ad Inferna,' is the general writing in the ancient MSS.; as the learned Archbishop testifieth of those in the Benedictine and Cottonian Libraries; to which I may add those in the Library at Westminster; we see the same likewise in that of Elipandus, 'Descendit ad Inferna.' Which words are so recited in the Creed delivered in the Catechism set forth by the authority of Edward VI. *An. Dom.* 1553.

[57] So the ancient MSS. in Bene't College Library, κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα· and the Confession made at Sirmium, εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα. Since that it is, *Descendit ad Inferos*, and κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου, or *Descendit ad Infernum*, as Venantius Fortunatus. *Expos. in Symb.* [xi. 1.] For τὰ κατώτατα is a fit interpretation, if we take *Inferna* according to the vulgar etymology; as St. Augustin, '*Inferi* eo quod infra sint, Latine appellantur.' *De Gen. ad lit. lib.* xii. *cap.* 34. [§. 66. vol. iii. p. 322 B.] or as Nonius Marcellus, '*Inferum* ab imo dictum, unde *Inferi*, quibus inferius nihil.' *Cap.* i. §. 221. Again, *Inferna* may well be translated ᾅδης, if it be taken according

St. Peter's words of Christ, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;* Acts ii. 27.
the second referring to that of St. Paul, *He descended into the* Ephes. iv. 9.
lower parts of the earth.

Secondly, I observe that in the Aquileian Creed, where this Article was first expressed, there was no mention of Christ's burial; but the words of their confession ran thus, *crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended* in inferna[58]. From whence there is no question but the observation of Ruffinus, who first
227 expounded it, was most true, that though the Roman and Oriental Creeds had not their words, yet they had the sense of

to the true origination, which is from the Greek ἔνεροι, with the Æolick digamma, from which dialect most of the Latin language came, Ϝένϝεροι, *Inferi.* Now ἔνεροι, according to the Greek composition, is nothing else but ὑποχθόνιοι· Ϝένεροι, οἱ νεκροὶ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἔρᾳ κεῖσθαι, ὅ ἐστιν, ἐν τῇ γῇ. *Etym.* and Suidas, Ἐνέροις, νεκροῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἔρᾳ κεῖσθαι. Ϝέρα is anciently the earth, from whence ἔραζε, χαμᾶζε, *to the earth:* ἔνεροι then are in the earth, as they supposed the manes or spirits of the dead to be: from whence Homer,

———Ἀΐδης ἐνέροισιν ἀνάσσων,
Ἰλ. ὁ. 188.

of Pluto; and Hesiod,

Τρέσσ' Ἀΐδης ἐνέροισι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσων· Θεογ. *v.* 850.

and in imitation of them Æschylus,

Γῆ τε καὶ Ἑρμῆ, βασιλεῦ τ' ἐνέρων,
Πέμψατ' ἔνερθεν ψυχὰν εἰς φάος.
Pers. v. 631.

Thus ἔνεροι are those which Æschylus elsewhere calls τοὺς γᾶς νέρθεν and τοὺς γῆς ἔνερθεν. And as ἔνεροι are *the souls of the dead in the earth,* so are *Inferi* in the first acception, that is, *Manes.* Pomponius Mela, 'Augylæ manes tantum deos putant;' *De Situ Orb. lib. i. cap.* 9. [c. 8. §. 8.] which Pliny delivers thus: 'Augylæ Inferos tantum colunt.' *Hist. Nat. lib.* v. *cap.* 8. and Solinus, 'Augylæ vero solos colunt Inferos.' *Polyhist. cap.* 34. *Inferi* were then first *ἔνεροι, the souls of men in the earth:* and as *manes* is not only taken for the souls below, but also for the place, as in the poet;

——— *Manesque profundi,*
Virg. Georg. i. 243.

and

— *Hæc manes veniat mihi fama sub imos;* Æneid. iv. 387.

so *Inferi* is most frequently used for the place under ground where the souls departed are; and the *Inferna* must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations. And so *Descendit ad Inferna,* κατῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδου, and *Descendit ad Inferos,* are the same.

[58] So are the words cited in Ruffinus, 'Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in Inferna.' And his observation upon them is this: 'Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, *Descendit ad Inferna;* sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo: vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod sepultus dicitur.' *Expos. Symb.* [§. 18. p. ccxii.] The same may also be observed in the Athanasian Creed, which has the Descent, but not the Sepulture; *Who suffered for our salvation, descended into Hell, rose again the third day from the dead.* Nor is this only observable in these two, but also in the Creed made at Sirmium, and produced at Ariminum, in which the words run thus, Σταυρωθέντα, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀποθανόντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα. [Socr. ii. 37.] Where though the Descent be expressed, and the Burial be not mentioned, yet it is most certain those men which made it (heretics indeed, but not in this) did not understand his Burial by that Descent: and that appears by addition of the following words; Εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε οἰκονομήσαντα, ὃν πυλωροὶ ᾅδου ἰδόντες ἔφριξαν. For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave, nor could the keepers of the gates of Hell be affrighted with any sight of his corpse lying in the sepulchre.

them in the word *buried*. It appeareth therefore that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the Aquileian Creed, to signify the burial of Christ; and those which had only the burial in their Creed, did confess as much as those which without the burial did express the descent: yet since the Roman Creed hath added the descent unto the burial, and expressed that descent by words signifying more properly hell, it cannot be imagined that the Creed, as it now stands, should signify only the burial of Christ by his descent into hell. But rather, being the ancient Church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend beside his burial; being Ruffinus himself, though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviour's death, makes mention of his descent into hell, beside, and distinct from, his sepulture[59]; being those who in after-ages added it to the burial, did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended: it followeth that, for the exposition of the Creed, it is most necessary to declare in what that descent consisteth.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed, we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them and the general consent of the Church of God. Now these words, as they lie in the Creed,

59 For having produced many places of Scripture to prove the circumstances of our Saviour's death, and having cited those particularly which did belong unto his Burial, he passes farther to his Descent, in these words; 'Sed et quod in Infernum descendit, evidenter prænuntiatur in Psalmis, ubi dicit, *Et in pulverem mortis deduxisti me;* et iterum, *Quæ utilitas in sanguine meo dum descendero in corruptionem?* et iterum, *Descendi in limum profundi, et non est substantia.* Sed et Joannes dicit, *Tu es qui venturus es, in infernum sine dubio, an alium exspectamus?* Unde et Petrus dixit, *Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu. In ipso,* ait, *eis qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe:* in quo etiam quid operis egerit in Inferno declaratur. Sed et ipse Dominus per Prophetam dicit tanquam de futuro, *Quia non derelinques animam meam in Inferno, nec dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem:* quod rursus prophetice nihilominus ostendit impletum, cum dicit, *Domine, eduxisti ab Inferno animam meam, salvasti me a descendentibus in lacum.*' [§. 28. p. ccxvii.] Whence it appeareth, that though Ruffinus thought that the sense of *descendit ad Inferna* was expressed in *sepultus est;* yet he did distinguish the doctrine of Christ's descent into Hell from that of his burial.

He descended into hell, are nowhere formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in express and plain terms, that Christ as he died and was buried, so *he descended into hell.* Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expressed in the Scripture, our inquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained, and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into hell.*

Now several places of Scripture have been produced by the ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not: but three there are which have been always thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, that of St. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to express the same almost in terms[60]; *Now* Eph. iv. 9.
228 *that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* This many of the ancient Fathers understood of the descent into hell[61], as placed in the lowest parts of the earth: and this exposition must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those *lower parts of the earth* may signify hell; and Christ's descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the Apostle intended so much in those words, the place itself will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ which St. Paul speaketh of, was performed

60 For the first expression which we find in Ruffinus, 'Descendit in Inferna,' comes most near to this quotation; especially if we take the ancient Greek translation of it, *κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα.* For if we consider that *κατώτερα* may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being the LXX. hath so translated Psalm lxiii. 9. *Εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς·* and Psalm cxxxix. 15. *Καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτω τῆς γῆς·* what can be nearer than these two, *κατελθὼν εἰς τὰ κατώτατα,* and *καταβὰς εἰς τὰ κατώτατα*? or these two, *κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια,* and *καταβάντα εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*?

61 This appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove, or express, the Descent into Hell, as Irenæus does, *lib.* v. *cap.* 31. Origen, *Homil.* 35. *in Matt.* Athanasius, *Epist. ad Epictetum,* Hilarius, *in Psal.* lxvii. St. Jerom upon the place; 'Inferiora autem terræ Infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit.' [vol. vii. p. 613 E.] So also the Commentary attributed to St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary; 'Si itaque hæc omnia Christus unus est, neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus, aut alius descendens ad Inferna, et alius ascendens in cœlos, secundum illud Apostoli, *Ascendit autem quid est,* &c.' *De Trin. lib.* x. *cap.* 65. [p. 1077 B.]

after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that *the lower parts of the earth* did signify hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their
John iii. 13. bodies. For as it is written, *No man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven;* so this may signify so much, and no more, *In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first?* And for *the lower parts of the earth,* they may possibly signify no more than the place beneath: as when our Saviour
John viii. 23. Acts ii. 19. said, *Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world:* or as God spake by the Prophet, *I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath.* Nay, they may well refer to his incarnation, according to that
Ps. cxxxix. 15. of David, *My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth;* or to
Ps. lxiii. 9. his burial, according to that of the same Prophet, *Those that seek my soul to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth:* and these two references have a great similitude, according to
Job i. 21. that of Job, *Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither.*

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the descent is not so near in words, but thought to signify the end of that descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended.
1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. For Christ, saith St. Peter, was *put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison:* where *the spirit* seems to be the soul of Christ; and *the spirits in prison,* the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least separated from the joys of heaven: whither because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the cross. This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the descent, and the ancient Fathers[62] did apply the same in the like manner to the

[62] As Hermas, *lib.* iii. *Simil.* 9. Irenæus, *lib.* iv. *cap.* 45. [c. 27.] Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* [*lib.* iii. *c.* 4. p. 526.] *lib.* vi. [c. 6.] Origen, *Homil.* 35. *in Matt.* St. Athanasius, *Cont. Apoll. lib.* ii. *et Epist. ad Epictetum.* Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxvii. §. 7. St. Cyril, *De recta fide ad Theodosium.* [vol. v. part ii. p. 20 B.] *In Joan. lib.* xii. *cap.* 36. [vol. iv. p. 1068 D.] *Orat. Pasch. et alibi sæpius.* Auctor Com. Ambros. ascript. *ad Rom.* 10. Ruffin *in Symb.**

* [To these may be added Tertull. *de Anima,* c. 7. 55. Origen, cont. Cels. II. 43. in Exod. §. 6. in Reg. Hom. 2. vol. ii. p. 496. in Psalm. vol. ii. p. 553 D. Hippolytus, de Antichristo, §. 26, 45. The reader is also referred to an excellent Sermon of Bishop Horsley upon this text, vol. ii. Serm. XX.]

proof of this Article. But yet those words of St. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the *spirit* there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they staggered St. Augustin[63], and caused him at last to think that these words of St. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into hell. But indeed *the spirit* by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that spirit by which he was *quickened;* as appeareth
229 by the coherence of the words, *being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.* Now that spirit by which Christ was quickened, is that by which he was raised from the dead[64], that is, the power of his Divinity; as St. Paul expresseth it, *Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God:* in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of Noah, as we have already shewn. 2 Cor. xiii. 4. Page 199.

The third, but principal, text is that of David, applied by St. Peter. For *David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was* Acts ii. 25, 26, 27, 30, 31.

63 For in his answer to Euodius he thus begins; 'Quæstio, quam mihi proposuisti ex Epistola Apostoli Petri, solet nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementissime commovere, quomodo illa verba accipienda sint tanquam de Inferis dicta. Replico ergo tibi eandem quæstionem, ut, sive ipse potueris, sive aliquem qui possit inveneris, auferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam.' Epist. xcix. cap. i. [Epist. clxiv. vol. ii. p. 573 D.] Then setting down in order all the difficulties which occurred at that time in that exposition of the Descent into Hell, he concludes with an exposition of another nature: 'Considera tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad Inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora, quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit.' Ibid. cap. 5. §. 15. p. 578 G.

64 'Quid est enim quod *vivificatus est spiritu*, nisi quod eadem caro, qua sola fuerat mortificatus, vivificante spiritu resurrexit? Nam quod fuerit anima mortificatus Jesus, hoc est, eo spiritu qui hominis est, quis audeat dicere? cum mors animæ non sit nisi peccatum, a quo ille omnino immunis fuit, cum pro nobis carne mortificaretur.' S. August. Epist. xcix. cap. 6. [Ep. clxiv. vol. ii. p. 580 C. §. 18, 19.] 'Certe anima Christi non solum immortalis secundum cæterarum naturam, sed etiam nullo mortificata peccato vel damnatione punita est; quibus duabus causis mors animæ intelligi potest; et ideo non secundum ipsam dici potuit, Christus *vivificatus spiritu.* In ea re quippe vivificatus est, in qua fuerat mortificatus: ergo de carne dictum est. Ipsa enim revixit anima redeunte, quia ipsa erat mortua anima recedente. *Mortificatus* ergo *carne* dictus est, quia secundum solam carnem mortuus est; *vivificatus* autem *spiritu,* quia illo spiritu operante in quo ad quos volebat veniebat et prædicabat, etiam ipsa caro vivificata surrexit, in qua modo ad homines venit.' Ibid. cap. 7. [§. 20.]

glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thus the Apostle repeated the words of the Psalmist, and then applied them: He *being a Prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.* Now from this place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection: but it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell; and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver that Christ, being *crucified*, was *dead, buried,* and *descended into hell.* For as his flesh did not see corruption by virtue of that promise and prophetical expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope until his resurrection: so his soul, which was not left in hell, by virtue of the like promise or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, until the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must therefore confess from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith St. Augustin, it is so clearly delivered in this prophecy of the Psalmist and application of the Apostle[65].

The only question then remains, not of the truth of the proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ *descended into hell;* and as infallibly true as any other Article of the Creed: but what that hell was, and how he descended thither, being once questioned, is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an exposition of the Creed as it now stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained: I must therefore look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the Creed, and may withal be conformable unto

65 'Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in Infernum satis constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno;* quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit; vel ejusdem Petri illis verbis quibus eum asserit *solvisse Inferni dolores, in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri.* Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud Inferos Christum?' *Epist.* xcix. [al. clxiv.] *cap.* 2. [§. 3. vol. i. p. 574 B.]

that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: and consequently, whatsoever interpretation is either not true in itself, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not
230 conformable to the doctrine of the Apostle in this particular, the expositor of that Creed by the doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus, who, as often, so in this, is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong unto the soul[66], and the name of *hell* to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody; but he maketh a metaphor in the word *descended*, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were; but only including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in hell: and because the merit of Christ's death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent; and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to *descend into hell*, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the exposition of this Article; being neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of so great scholastic subtilty, nor the place of David, expounded by St. Peter, can possibly admit any such explication. For what can be the sense of those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, if his being in hell was only virtually acting there? If the efficacy of his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion therefore of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expositive of the Creed's confession, nor consistent with the Scripture's expression.

The next opinion, later than that of Durandus, is, that the

66 'Cum Articulus sit, Christum ad Inferos descendisse, et non possit intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quam est ubique; nec ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulchro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animæ: quo supposito, videndum est qualiter anima Christi descendit ad Infernum.' *Durand. Com. in Sentent. Theol. lib.* iii. *dist.* 22. *q.* 3. §. 4.

descent into hell is the suffering of the torments of hell[67]; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatened by the Law unto them which depart this life in their sins, and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and borne by Christ; that he died a true supernatural death, the second death, the death of Gehenna; and this dying the death of Gehenna was the *descending into hell;* that those which are now saved by virtue of his death, should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned do and shall endure; but that he, being their surety, did himself suffer the same for them[68], even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the exposition of this Article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formal sense; for in that acceptation it is not true. It must not, it cannot, be admitted that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer; and therefore it is not, it cannot, be true, that by suffering them he descended into hell. There is a worm that never dieth, which could not lodge within his breast; that is, a remorse of conscience, seated in the soul, for what that soul hath done: but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been 231
damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the sins and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God; but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the souls condemned to eternal flames. Again,

67 'Si [Christus] ad Inferos descendisse dicitur, nihil mirum est, cum eam mortem pertulerit quæ sceleratis ab irato Deo infligitur;' which he expresseth presently in another phrase, — 'diros in anima cruciatus damnati ac perditi hominis pertulerit.' *Calvin. Instit. lib.* ii. *cap.* 16. §. 10.

68 'Quid igitur? Christus persona sua secundum humanitatem pœnam gehennalem nobis debitam passus est, anima principaliter, corpore secundario, utroque causaliter ad merendum, ad nos suo ipsius merito liberandos.' *Parkerus de Descensu, lib.* iii. §. 48. *Et statim,* §. 49. 'Descendisse namque Servatorem, modo supra memorato, ad Haden mortis gehennalis, innumeris patet argumentis.'

an essential part of the torments of hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour, and avoiding pain; an absolute and complete despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation: but Christ, we know, had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the cross, and offered up himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any damned soul to have received an express promise of God, that after ten thousand years he would release him from those torments, and make him everlastingly happy; and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternal life; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins: because hope and confidence, and relying upon God, would not only mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more than he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion than he had himself determined, he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of hell.

Again, if we take the torments of hell in a metaphorical sense, for those terrors and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernal torments, because they are of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men; yet this cannot be an interpretation of the descent into hell, as it is an Article of the Creed, and as that Article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such), were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the cross; but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident that

the descent into hell, as it now stands in the Creed, signifieth something commenced after his death, contradistinguished to his burial; and, as it is considered in the Apostle's explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his resurrection; and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains. For it is thus particularly expressed:

Ps. xvi. 8, 9, 10. *I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.* Where the faith, hope, confidence, and assurance of Christ is shewn; and his *flesh*, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to *rest in hope*, for this very reason, because God would not *leave* his *soul in hell*. I conclude therefore, that the descent into hell is not the enduring the torments of hell: because, if strictly taken, 232
it is not true; if metaphorically taken, though it be true, yet it is not pertinent.

The third opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, the *soul* of Christ is taken for his body, and *hell* for the grave, and consequently, in the Creed, *he descended into hell*, is no more than this, that Christ in his body was laid into the grave. This explication ordinarily is rejected, by denying that the *soul* is ever taken for the body, or *hell* for the grave: but in vain; for it must be acknowledged that sometimes the Scriptures are rightly so, and cannot otherwise be, understood. First, the same word in the Hebrew [69], which the

[69] The Hebrew word is נפש, and the Greek ψυχή, לא־תעזב נפשי לשאול, Οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην. Psalm xvi. 10. But both נפש and ψυχή are used for the body of a dead man, Num. vi. 6. and it is so translated; for Moses, speaking there of a Nazarite, gives this law, *All the days that he separateth himself unto the Lord he shall come at no dead body;* in the original, על־נפש מת לא יבא, and in the LXX. Ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται. In the same manner the law for the High Priest, Lev. xxi. 11. *Neither shall he go in to any dead body,* ועל כל־נפשת מת לא יבא, Καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται. And the general law, Lev. xxii. 4. *And whoso toucheth any thing that is unclean by the dead,* והנגע בכל־טמא־נפש, Καὶ ὁ ἁπτόμενος πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας ψυχῆς. Which is farther cleared by that of Num. xix. 11. *He that toucheth the dead body of any man, Qui tetigerit cadaver hominis;* and ver. 13. *Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, Omnis qui tetigerit humanæ animæ morticinum.* Therefore the נפש and ψυχή in Lev. xxii. 4. do signify the *cadaver* or *morticinum;* as also Num. v. 2. *Whosoever is defiled by the dead* כל טמא לנפש, Πάντα ἀκάθαρτον ἐπὶ ψυχῇ. *Pollutum super mortuo.* And טמא־נפש Ἀκάθαρτος ἐπὶ ψυχῇ· Hag. ii. 13. is rightly translated, *One that is unclean by a dead body.* Thus several times נפש and ψυχή are taken for the body of a dead man; that body which polluted a

Psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the Apostle used, and we translate *the soul*, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and translated so. And when we read in Moses of a prohibition given to the High Priest or to the Nazarite, of going to or coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the dead; the *dead body* in the Hebrew and the Greek is nothing else but that which elsewhere signifieth the soul. And Mr. Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, hath so delivered it in compliance with the original phrase; and may be well interpreted thus by our translation, *Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a soul*, that is *for the dead. For a soul he shall not defile himself among his people*, that is, *There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people: He that toucheth any* thing that is *unclean* by *a soul*, that is, *by the dead: Every one defiled by a soul*, that is, *by the dead: He shall not come at a dead soul*, that is, *He shall come at no dead body*. Thus Ainsworth's translation sheweth, that in all these places the original word is that which usually signifieth the soul; and our translation teacheth us, that though in other places it signifieth the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul.

Lev. xix. 28. Lev. xxi. 1. Lev. xxi. 4. Num. v. 2. Num. vi 6.

Secondly, the word[70] which the Psalmist used in Hebrew,

man under the Law by the touch thereof. And Maimonides hath observed, that there is no pollution from the body till the soul be departed. Therefore נפש and ψυχή did signify the body after the separation of the soul. And this was anciently observed by St. Augustin, that the *soul* may be taken for the body only. 'Animæ nomine corpus solum posse significari, modo quodam locutionis ostenditur, quo significatur per id quod continetur illud quod continet; sicut ait quidam, *Vina coronant*, cum coronarentur vasa vinaria; vinum enim continetur, et vas continet. Sicut ergo appellamus ecclesiam basilicam, qua continetur populus, qui vere appellatur ecclesia, ut nomine ecclesiæ, id est, populi qui continetur, significemus locum qui continet: ita quod animæ corporibus continentur, intelligi corpora filiorum per nominatas animas possunt. Sic enim melius accipitur etiam illud, quod Lex inquinari dicit eum qui intraverit super animam mortuam, hoc est, super defuncti cadaver; ut nomine animæ mortuæ mortuum corpus intelligatur, quod animam continebat; quia et absente populo, id est ecclesia, locus tamen ille nihilominus ecclesia nuncupatur.' *Epist.* clvii. *ad Optatum, de Animarum Origine, cap.* 5. [Epist. cxc. 19. vol. ii. p. 705 F.]

70 The Hebrew word is שאול, the Greek, ᾅδης. כי לא־תעזב נפשי לשאול Ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην (or εἰς ᾅδου, as it is read in the Acts and in the Psalms, also by the ancient MS. at St. James's.) And these generally run together, and sometimes signify no more than the grave, as Gen. xxxvii. 35. where Jacob, thinking that his son Joseph had been dead, breaks out into this sad expression, כי־ארד אל־בני אבל שאלה Ὅτι καταβήσομαι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν μου πενθῶν εἰς ᾅδου· which we translate *For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning*, upon the authority of the ancient Targums. For although that of Onkelos keep the original word, לשאול, yet the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan render it

and the Apostle in Greek, and is translated *hell*, doth certainly 233
in some other places signify no more than the *grave*, and is
Genesis translated so: as where Mr. Ainsworth following the word, *For*
xxxvii. 35. *I will go down unto my son mourning to hell;* our translation
aiming at the sense, rendereth it, *For I will go down into the*
xlii. 38. *grave unto my son mourning.* So again he, *Ye shall bring down*
my grey hairs with sorrow unto hell, that is, *to the grave.* And in
1 Sam. ii. 6. this sense we say, *The Lord killeth, and maketh alive; he bringeth*
down to the grave, and bringeth up.

Now being the *soul* is sometimes taken for the body deserted by the soul, and *hell* is also sometimes taken for the grave, the receptacle of the body dead, therefore it is conceived that the Prophet did intend these significations in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell;* and consequently the Article grounded on that Scripture must import no more than this; Christ in respect of his body bereft of his soul, which was recommended into, and deposited in the hands of his Father, *descended into* the grave.

This exposition hath that great advantage, that he which first mentioned this descent in the Creed, did interpret it of the burial; and where this Article was expressed, there that of the burial was omitted. But notwithstanding those advantages, there is no certainty of this interpretation: first, because he which did so interpret it, at the same time, and in the tenure of that exposition, did acknowledge a descent of the soul of Christ into hell[71]; and those other Creeds which did likewise

לבי קבורתא, *in domum sepulchri;* and the Persian Targum, to the same purpose, בגור; as also the Arabic translation, *Imo descendam ad pulverem mœstus de filio meo.* So Gen. xlii. 38. והורדתם את־שיבתי ביגון שאולה, Καὶ καταξετέ μου τὸ γῆρας μετὰ λύπης εἰς ᾅδου· which we translate, *Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave:* where the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan have it again לבי קבורתא; and the Persian again בגור *in sepulchrum;* the Arabic אלי אלתרי *ad pulverem*, or *ad terram.* And it is observed by the Jewish Commentators, that those Christians are mistaken who interpret those words spoken by Jacob, *I will go down into Sheol*, of Hell; declaring that *Sheol* there is nothing else but the grave.*

71 Ruffinus, who first mentioned this Article, did interpret it of the Grave, as we have already observed; but yet he did believe a descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed: 'Sed et quod in Infernum descendit, evidenter prænunciatur in Psalmis, &c. and then citing that of St. Peter, Unde et Petrus dixit, *Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu. In ipso*, ait, *eis qui in carcere inclusi erant descendit spiritibus prædicare, qui increduli fuere in diebus Noe*, in quo etiam quid operis egerit in Inferno declaratur.' [§. 28. p. ccxvii.] as we before more largely cited the same place.

* [The English word *Hell* is derived from the Anglo-Saxon Helan, *to cover*, and is therefore nearly the same with ᾅδης.]

omit the burial, and express the descent[72], did shew, that by that descent they understood not that of the body, but of the soul. Secondly, because they which put these words into the Roman Creed, in which the burial was expressed before, must certainly understand a descent distinct from that; and therefore though it might perhaps be thought a probable interpretation of the words of David, especially taken as belonging to David, yet it cannot pretend to an exposition of the Creed, as now it stands.

The next opinion is, that the soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguished from the body; or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is; or for the living soul, as it is distinguished from the immortal spirit: but then the term *hell* shall signify no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor of the soul; but only the state or condition of men in death, during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the prophecy shall run thus, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my natural life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vital faculty: and then the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was *crucified, dead, and buried*, and *descended into hell;* that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men do.

But this interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *hades* signifieth not death itself, nor the place where souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permansion in death; which is a notion wholly new, and con-
234 sequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the notions and conceptions of those times. And that this notion is wholly new will appear, because not any of the ancient fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen authors which are produced do

72 I shewed before, that in the Creed made at Sirmium there was the Descent mentioned, and the Burial omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed that it could not be taken for the Burial: besides now I add, that it was made by the Arians, who in few years before had given in another Creed, in which both the Burial and the Descent were mentioned; as that of Nice in Thracia, Ἀποθανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ ᾅδης ἐτρόμασε. *Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 21. and not long after gave in another at Constantinople to the same purpose, Σταυρωθέντα, καὶ ἀποθανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, ὅν τινα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ᾅδης ἔπτηξεν. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 41.

affirm it: nay, it is evident that the Greeks did always by *hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed, distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different opinions shew, placing it, some in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *hades*, in the judgment of the ancient Greeks, cannot consist with this notion of the state of death, and the permansion in that condition, because there were many which they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, which yet they believed not to be in *hades*; as those who died before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied[73].

73 The opinion of the ancient Greeks in this case is excellently expressed by Tertullian, who shews three kinds of men to be thought not to descend *ad Inferos* when they die; the first *Insepulti*, the second *Aori*, the third *Biæothanati*. 'Creditum est, insepultos non ante ad Inferos redigi quam justa perceperint.' *De Anim. cap.* 56. [p. 304 C.] 'Aiunt et immatura morte præventas eousque vagari isthic, donec reliquatio compleatur ætatum quas tum pervixissent si non intempestive obiissent.' *Ibid.* [p. 305 A.] 'Proinde nec extorres Inferum habebuntur, quas vi ereptas arbitrantur, præcipua atrocitate suppliciorum; crucis dico et securis, et gladii, et feræ.' *Ibid.* The souls then of those whose bodies were unburied were thought to be kept out of Hades till their funerals were performed, and the souls of them who died an untimely or a violent death were kept from the same place until the time of their natural death should come. This he farther expresses in the terms of the Magicians, whose art was conversant about souls departed. 'Aut optimum est hic retineri secundum ahoros (i. e. ἀώρους); aut pessimum, secundum biæothanatos (βιαιωθανάτους), ut ipsis jam vocabulis utar, quibus auctrix opinionum istarum Magica sonat, Hostanes, et Typhon, et Dardanus, et Damigeron, et Nectabis, et Bernice. Publica jam littera est, quæ animas etiam justa ætate sopitas, etiam proba morte disjunctas, etiam prompta humatione dispunctas, evocaturam se ab Inferum incolatu pollicetur.' *Ibid. cap.* 57. Of that of the *Insepulti*, he produceth the example of Patroclus: 'Secundum Homericum Patroclum funus in somnis de Achille flagitantem, quod non alias adire portas Inferum posset, arcentibus eum longe animabus sepultorum.' *Ibid. cap.* 56. The place he intended is that, Ἰλ. ψ'. 71.

Θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα, πύλας ἀΐδαο περήσω.
Τῆλέ με εἴργουσιν ψυχαὶ, εἴδωλα καμόντων,
Οὐδέ μέ πω μίσγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐῶσιν.

In the same manner he describes Elpenor;

Πρώτη δὲ ψυχὴ Ἐλπήνορος ἦλθεν ἑταίρου·
Οὐ γάρ πω ἐτέθαπτο ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης. Ὀδ. λ'. 51.

Where it is the observation of Eustathius, Ὅτι δόξα ἦν τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὰς τῶν ἀθάπτων ψυχὰς μὴ ἀναμίγνυσθαι ταῖς λοιπαῖς. And the same Eustathius observes an extraordinary accurateness in that question of Penelope concerning Ulysses, upon the same ground;

Εἴ που ἔτι ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἠελίοιο,
Ἦ ἤδη τέθνηκε, καὶ εἰν ἀΐδαο δόμοισι. Ὀδ. δ'. 833.

Τὸ δὲ, καὶ ὁρᾷ φῶς ἡλίου, δι' ὀρθότητα ἐννοίας κεῖται· ὡς δυνατὸν ὂν ζῆν μὲν, μὴ βλέπειν δέ. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ, εἰν ἀΐδαο δόμοισι, πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν λόγου ἐρρέθη· κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς δηλωθησόμενον Ἑλληνικὸν μῦθον, οὐ πᾶς τεθνηκὼς καὶ ἐν ᾅδου γίνεται, εἰ μὴ καὶ πυρᾷ δυθῇ, καθὰ καὶ ὁ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου ἐμφαίνει Πολύδωρος· ὥστε τὸ, ἦ ἤδη τέθνηκε, καὶ εἰν ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἦ ἤδη τέθνηκε, καὶ τέθαπται. It is here very observable, that, according to the opinion of the Greeks, to be dead

Thus likewise the ancient fathers differed much concerning the place of the *infernus;* but never any doubted but that it signi-
235 fied some place or other[74]: and if they had conceived any such notion as the state of death, and the permansion of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into those doubts or questions; the Patriarchs and the Prophets being as certainly in the state of death, and remaining so, as Corah, Dathan, and

is one thing, and to be in Hades is another: and that every one which died was not in Hades, Οὐ πᾶς τεθνηκὼς καὶ ἐν ᾅδου γίνεται, as Eustathius speaks. 'Legimus præterea in sexto insepultorum animas vagas esse.' *Serv. Com. in Æneid.* iii. 68. The place which he intended I suppose is this,

Hæc omnis, quam cernis, inops inhumataque turba est;
Portitor ille, Charon; hi, quos vehit unda, sepulti.
Nec ripas datur horrendas et rauca fluenta
Transportare prius, quam sedibus ossa quierunt.
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc littora circum.
Virg. Æneid. vi. 325.

Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus;

Ergo instauramus Polydoro funus, et ingens
Aggeritur tumulo tellus ——— ———
——— ———*animamque sepulchro*
Condimus ——— ———
Æneid. iii. 62.

Not that *anima* does there signify the body, as some have observed; but that the soul of Polydorus was then in rest when his body had received funeral rites, as Servius, 'Legimus præterea in sexto insepultorum animas vagas esse; et hinc constat non legitime sepultum fuisse. Rite ergo, reddita legitima sepultura, redit anima ad quietem sepulchri,' saith Servius; or rather, in the sense of Virgil, 'ad quietem Inferni,' according to the petition of Palinurus,

Sedibus ut saltem placidis in morte quiescam. Æneid. vi. 371.

And that the soul of Polydorus was so wandering about the place where his body lay unburied, appeareth out of Euripides in Hecuba, where he speaketh thus,—

——— Νῦν ὑπὲρ μητρὸς φίλης
Ἑκάβης ἀΐσσω, σῶμ' ἐρημώσας ἐμόν,
Τριταῖον ἤδη φέγγος αἰωρούμενος.
v. 30.

And in the Troades of the same poet this ἄλη, or erratio vagabunda insepultorum, is acknowledged by the Chorus in these words,

Ὦ φίλος, ὦ πόσι μοι,
Σὺ μὲν φθίμενος ἀλαίνεις
Ἄθαπτος, ἄνυδρος. *v.* 1082.

And when their bodies were buried, then their souls passed into Hades, to the rest. So was it with Polydorus, and that man mentioned in the history of the philosopher Athenodorus, whose *umbra* or *phasma* walked after his death. 'Inveniuntur ossa inserta catenis et implicita, quæ corpus ævo terraque putrefactum nuda et exesa reliquerat vinculis: collecta publice sepeliuntur; domus postea rite conditis manibus caruit.' *Plin. lib.* vii. *Epist.* 27. This was the case of the *Insepulti.* And for that of the *Biæothanati,* it is remarkable that Dido threateneth Æneas,

——*Sequar atris ignibus absens;*
Et, cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus,
Omnibus umbra locis adero.———
Æneid. iv. 384.

Upon which place Servius observes, 'Dicunt physici biæothanatorum animas non recipi in originem suam, nisi vagantes legitimum tempus fati compleverint; quod poetæ ad sepulturam transferunt, ut, Æneid. vi. 329.

Centum errant annos.——

Hoc ergo nunc dicit Dido, Occisura me ante diem sum; vaganti mihi dabis pœnas: nam te persequar, et adero quam diu erravero semper.'

[74] Ἅιδης δὲ, τόπος ἡμῖν ἀειδὴς, ἤγουν ἀφανὴς καὶ ἄγνωστος, ὁ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδημούσας δεχόμενος. *Andreas Cæsar. in Apocal. cap.* 64.

Abiram are, or any person which is certainly condemned to everlasting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true that Christ did truly and properly die, as other men are wont to do, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead, in deadlihood, as some have learned to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he *was dead*. And although it is true that he might have died, and in the next minute of time revived, and consequently his death doth not (precisely taken) signify any permansion or duration in the state of death, and therefore it might be added, *he descended into hell*, to signify farther a permansion or duration in that condition; yet if *hell* do signify nothing else but the state of the dead, as this opinion doth suppose, then to *descend into hell* is no more than to be dead; and so notwithstanding any duration implied in that expression, Christ might have ascended the next minute after he descended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he died. Being then to *descend into hell*, according to this interpretation, is no more than to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that person was dead who died; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Christ died, or, as we render it, *was dead;* we cannot imagine but they which did add this part of the Article to the Creed, did intend something more than this, and therefore we cannot admit this notion as a full or proper exposition.

There is yet left another interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the Church of Christ in all ages, and upon a probable exposition of the prophecy of the Psalmist, taking the *soul* in the most proper sense, for the spirit or rational part of Christ; that part of a man which, according to our Saviour's doctrine, the Jews could not kill; and looking upon *hell* as a place distinct from this part of the world where we live, and distinguished from those heavens whither Christ ascended, into which place the souls of men were conveyed after or upon their death; and therefore thus expounding the words of the Psalmist in the person of Christ; Thou shalt not suffer that soul of mine which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the cross, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall go into that place below where the souls of men departed are detained; I say, thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly from thence, and reunite it to my body.

For the better understanding of this exposition, there are several things to be observed, both in respect of the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the fathers. First therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, That the soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure: according to the ground of our Saviour's counsel, (*Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.*) That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal nature, as we believe; or at least by the will of God, and his power upholding and preserving
236 it from dissolution, as many of the fathers thought. This soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spiritual, is really and truly in some place; if not by way of circumscription, as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistancy; so that it is true to say, this soul is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere. Matt. x. 28.

Again, the soul of man, which, while he lived, gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death, must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the souls of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness; others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour's death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there were two societies of souls after death; one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their sins and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous Abel the first man placed in this happiness, and the souls of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sons of Adam which first died in his sins, was put into a place of torment; and the souls of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them, were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the souls at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies; so the place where they are in rest or misery

after death, is certainly distinct from the place in which they lived. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not go together with the body to the grave; but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle, or habitation and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the soul doth certainly pass by a real motion from that place in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place, and unto that society, which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to inquire into the difference and distance of those several habitations (but for method's sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the infernal parts, or the mansions below), it will appear to have been the general judgment of the Church, that the soul of Christ contradistinguished from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his rational and intellectual soul, after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below, where the souls of men before departed were detained; and that by such a real translation of his soul, he was truly said to have descended into hell.

Many have been the interpretations of the opinion of the fathers made of late; and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more than this which I have already affirmed, a real descent of the soul of Christ unto the habitation of the souls departed. The persons to whom, and end for which, he descended, they differ in; but as to a local descent into the infernal parts, they all agree. Who were then in those parts, they could not certainly define; but whosoever were there, that Christ by the presence of his soul was with them, they all determined.

That this was the general opinion of the Church, will appear, not only by the testimonies of those ancient writers[75] which 237

[75] As Irenæus; 'Cum enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, et post resurrectionem assumptus est: manifestum est, quia et discipulorum ejus, propter quos et hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis a Deo, &c.' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* v. *cap.* 26. [c. 31. §. 2. p. 331.] Clemens Alexandrinus was so clearly of that opinion, that he thought the soul of Christ preached salvation to the souls in hell. *Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 6.] And Tertullian proves that the Inferi are a cavity in the earth, where the souls of dead men are, because the soul of Christ went thither. 'Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo mortuus secundum scripturas, et sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque

lived successively, and wrote in several ages, and delivered this exposition in such express terms as are not capable of any other interpretation: but also because it was generally used as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy: than which nothing can shew more the general opinion of the Catholics and the heretics, and that not only of the present, but of the precedent ages. For it had been little less than ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in controversy, which had not been clearer than that which was controverted, and had not been some way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the error of Apollinarius was, that Christ had no proper

legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud Inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic Patriarchas et Prophetas compotes sui faceret; habes et regionem Inferum subterraneam credere, et illos cubito pellere, qui satis superbe non putant animas fidelium Inferis dignas.' *De Anim. cap.* 55. [p. 304 A.] Γυμνῇ σώματος γειόμενος ψυχῇ ταῖς γυμναῖς σωμάτων ὡμίλει ψυχαῖς. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [c. 43. p. 419 D.] 'Ipsa anima, etsi fuit in abysso, jam non est; quia scriptum est, *Non derelinques animam meam in Inferno.*' S. Ambros. *de Incarn. cap.* 5. [§. 42. vol. ii. p. 713 B.] 'Si ergo secundum hominem, quem Verbum Deus suscepit, putamus dictum esse, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiso*, non ex his verbis in cœlo existimandus est esse paradisus. Neque enim ipso die in cœlo futurus erat homo Christus Jesus; sed in Inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro autem secundum carnem. Et de carne quidem, quod eo die in sepulchro sit posita, manifestissimum est Evangelium. Quod vero illa anima in Infernum descenderit, Apostolica doctrina prædicat. Quandoquidem B. Petrus ad hanc rem testimonium de Psalmis adhibet, ubi prædictum esse demonstrat, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno, neque dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.* Illud de anima dictum est, quia non ibi est derelicta, unde tam cito remeavit; illud de corpore, quod in sepulchro corrumpi celeri resurrectione non potuit.' S. August. *Epist.* lvii. *ad Dardanum*, c. 2. [Epist. clxxxvii. cap. 5. vol ii. p. 679 C.]—

Καταβὰς μέχρι καὶ χθονὸς
Ἐπίδημος ἐφαμέροις,
Κατέβας δ' ὑπὸ τάρταρα,
Ψυχῶν ὅθι μυρία
Θάνατος νέμεν ἔθνεα.
Φρίξεν σε γέρων τότε
Ἀΐδας ὁ παλαιγενὴς,
Καὶ λαοβόρος κύων
Ἀνεχάσσατο βηλοῦ.
Synes. Hymn. ix. *v.* 7.

Ψυχὴ δὲ ἡ θεία, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν λαχοῦσα συνδρομήν τε καὶ ἕνωσιν, καταπεφοίτηκε μὲν εἰς ᾅδου, θεοπρεπεῖ δὲ δυνάμει καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ χρωμένη, καὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε πνεύμασι κατεφαίνετο. Cyril. Alex. *Dial. de Incarn.* [vol. v. part i. p. 693 B.] Ὁ μὲν τάφος οὐτοῦ σωμα μόνον ὑπεδέξατο, ψυχὴν δὲ μόνην ὁ ᾅδης. Anast. *apud Euthym. Panopl. vol.* ii. *tit.* 17. 'Postquam igitur exaltatus est, id est, a Judæis in cruce suspensus, et spiritum reddidit, unita suæ Divinitati anima ad Inferorum profunda descendit.' *Auctor Serm. de Tempore.* 'Corpore in sepulchro seposito, Divinitas cum anima hominis ad Inferna descendens vocavit de locis suis animas sanctorum.' *Gaudentius Brix. Tract.* 10. [p. 819 B.] 'In hoc Divinitas Christi virtutem suæ impassibilitatis ostendit, quæ ubique, semper atque ineffabiliter præsens, et secundum animam suam in Inferno sine doloribus fuit, et secundum carnem suam in sepulchro sine corruptione jacuit; quia nec carni suæ defuit, cum animam suam in Inferno dolere non sineret; nec animam suam in Inferno deseruit, cum in sepulchro carnem suam a corruptione servaret.' *Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib.* iii. *cap.* 31.

intellectual or rational soul, but that the word was to him in the place of a soul: and the argument produced by the fathers for the conviction of this error was, that Christ descended into hell[76]; which the Apollinarians could not deny: and that this

76 What the Apollinarian* heresy was is certainly known: they denied that Christ had an human soul, affirming that the Word was to him in the place of a soul. 'Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi a Catholicis dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua quæstione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, defuisse animæ Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse, dixerunt.' *S. August. de Hæres.* 55. [vol. viii. p. 19 B.] Against this heresy the Catholics argued from the descent into hell, as that which was acknowledged by them all, even by the Arians, (with whom the Apollinarians in this agreed,) as we have shewn before by three several Creeds of theirs, in which they expressed this Descent. This is the argument of Athanasius in his fourth Dialogue *de Trinitate,* which is particularly with an Apollinarian: *Ὥσπερ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μνήματι καὶ ἐν ταφῇ γενέσθαι, εἰ μὴ εἶχεν τὸ τιθέμενον σῶμα, οὕτως οὐκ ἂν ἐλέχθη κεχωρίσθαι τοῦ σώματος, πανταχοῦ ὢν καὶ τὰ πάντα περιέχων, εἰ μὴ εἶχε τὴν χωριζομένην ψυχὴν, μεθ' ἧς καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδου εὐηγγελίσατο· διὰ γὰρ αὐτὴν καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν τοῦ σώματος λέγεται, καὶ ἐν ᾅδου γεγενῆσθαι· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾅδου γενέσθαι διὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἐν μνήματι τεθῆναι διὰ τὸ σῶμα.* But because these Dialogues may be questioned as not genuine†, the same argument may be produced out of his book *de Incarnatione Christi*, written particularly against Apollinarius: *Πείσθητε οὖν, ὅτι ὁ ἔσωθεν ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή· τοῦτο καὶ τῆς πρώτης πλάσεως δεικνυούσης, καὶ τῆς δευτέρας διαλύσεως δηλούσης, οὐ μόνον ἐφ' ἡμῖν τούτων δεικνυμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδείκνυτο· τὸ μέντοι, μέχρι τάφου φθάσαν· ἡ δὲ, μέχρι ᾅδου διαβᾶσα· διαιρετῶν δὲ ὄντων τῶν τόπων πολλῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ τοῦ μὲν τάφου σωματικὴν ἐπιδεχομένου τὴν ἐπίβασιν, ἐκεῖσε παρῆν τὸ σῶμα· τοῦ δὲ ᾅδου ἀσώματον· πῶς ἐκεῖ παρὼν ὁ Κύριος ἀσωμάτως, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐνομίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου; ἵνα ψυχαῖς ταῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς κατεχομέναις μορφὴν ἰδίας ψυχῆς ἀνεπιδεκτὸν ὡς δεκτικὴν τῶν δεσμῶν τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσας, παροῦσαν παρούσαις, διαρρήξῃ τὰ δεσμὰ ψυχῶν τῶν ἐν ᾅδῃ κατεχομένων. Cont. Apoll. lib.* i. [c. 13. vol. i. p. 933 C.] Thus Euthymius, in his commentary upon the words of the Psalmist, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell: Τίθησι καὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος τὴν αἰτίαν· Καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις, φησὶ, τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην, ὅπου τῶν τετελευτηκότων αἱ ψυχαὶ κατέχονται· τόπος γὰρ ὁ ᾅδης ὑπὸ γῆν ἀποκεκληρωμένος ταῖς τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων ψυχαῖς· ποῦ τοίνυν ὁ λῆρος Ἀπολλινάριος, ὃ τὴν προσληφθεῖσαν σάρκα δογματίζων ἄψυχον καὶ ἄνουν, ὡς ἀνόητος*; [in Theophylact. vol. iv. p. 412 A. ed. Ven. 1763.] And from hence we may understand the words of Theodoret, who at the end of his exposition of this Psalm thus concludes, [vol. i. p. 450 A.] *Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς καὶ τὴν Ἀρείου, καὶ τὴν Εὐνομίου, καὶ Ἀπολλιναρίου φρενοβλάβειαν ἐλέγχει·* which is in reference to those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.* In the same manner Leporius Presbyter ('quod male senserat de Incarnatione Christi corrigens,' as Gennadius observeth, *Illust. Viror. Catal.* 60. and particularly disavowing that of the Arians and Apollinarians, 'Deum hominemque commixtum, et tali confusione carnis et Verbi quasi aliquod corpus effectum') does thus express the reality and distinction of the soul and body in the same Christ: 'Tam Christus filius Dei

* [Apollinarius Junior was bishop of Laodicea in Syria, and flourished about A.D. 370.]

† [They are certainly not the work of Athanasius. Some have ascribed them to Maximus, who lived in the seventh century. The passage is in the second volume of the works of Athanasius, p. 529 F.]

descent was not made by his divinity, or by his body, but by the motion, and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answered by the heretics, as now it is by many, that his descent into hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body only, which descended into the grave; or that it was not a real, but only virtual, descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of hell; or that his soul was not his intellectual spirit, or immortal soul, but his living soul, which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this Article, the Apollinarians' answer might have been sound, and the Catholics' argument of no validity. But being those heretics did all acknowledge this Article; being the Catholic fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the souls below; it followeth that it was the general doctrine of the Church, that

tunc mortuus jacuit in sepulchro, quam idem Christus filius Dei ad Inferna descendit; sicut beatus Apostolus dicit, *Quod autem ascendit, quid est nisi quod descendit primum in inferiores partes terræ?*—Ipse utique Dominus et Deus noster Jesus Christus unicus Dei, qui cum anima ad Inferna descendit, ipse cum anima et corpore ascendit ad cœlum.' *Libel. Emendationis.* [c. ix. p. 399 C.] And Capreolus bishop of Carthage, writing against the Nestorian heresy, proveth that the soul of Christ was united to his Divinity when it descended into Hell, and follows that argument, urging it at large: in which discourse among the rest he hath this passage; 'Tantum abest, Deum Dei filium, incommutabilem atque incomprehensibilem, ab Inferis potuisse concludi; ut nec ipsam adsumptionis animam credamus, aut exitiabiliter susceptam, aut tenaciter derelictam. Sed nec carnem ejus credimus contagione alicujus corruptionis infectam. Ipsius namque vox est in Psalmo, sicut Petrus interpretatur Apostolus, *Non derelinques animam meam apud Inferos, neque dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.*' *Epist. ad Vital. et Constant.* [§. 5. p. 494 E.] Lastly, The true doctrine of the Incarnation against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the verity of the soul of Christ really present in Hell, and the verity of his body at the same time really present in the grave; as it is excellently delivered by Fulgentius: 'Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in Inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, et secundum animam ad Infernum Christus descendit; ac secundum eandem animam ab Inferno ad carnem quam in sepulchro reliquerat rediit; secundum divinitatem vero suam, quæ nec loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in Inferno cum anima; ac per hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus; quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam susceperat separatus, qui et in anima sua fuit, ut solutis Inferni doloribus ab Inferno victrix rediret, et in carne sua fuit, ut celeri resurrectione corrumpi non posset.' *Ad Thrasim. lib.* iii. *c.* 34. [p. 140.]

Christ did descend into hell by a local motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the souls of men departed were.

Nor can it be reasonably objected, that the argument of the 238
fathers was of equal force against these heretics, if it be understood of the animal soul, as it would be if it were understood of the rational; as if those heretics had equally deprived Christ of the rational and animal soul. For it is most certain that they did not equally deprive Christ of both; but most of the Apollinarians denied an human soul to Christ only in respect of the intellectual part[77], granting that the animal soul of Christ was of the same nature with the animal soul of other men. If therefore the fathers had proved only that the animal soul of Christ had descended into hell, they had brought no argument at all to prove that Christ had an human intellectual soul. It is therefore certain that the Catholic fathers in their opposition to the Apollinarian heretics did declare, that the intellectual and immortal soul of Christ descended into hell.

The only question which admitted any variety of discrepance among the ancients was, Who were the persons to whose souls the soul of Christ descended? and that which dependeth on that question, What was the end and use of his descent? In this indeed they differed much, according to their several apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and the nature of the place into which the souls before our Saviour's death were gathered; some looking on that name which we translate now *hell*, *hades*, or *infernus*, as the common receptacle of the souls of all men[78], 239

77 At first indeed the Apollinarians did so speak, as they denied the human soul in both acceptions; but afterwards they clearly affirmed the ψυχή, and denied the νοῦς alone. So Socrates testifies of them: Πρότερον μὲν ἔλεγον ἀναληφθῆναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ψυχῆς ἄνευ· εἶτα ὡς ἐκ μετανοίας ἐπιδιορθούμενοι, προσέθεσαν ψυχὴν μὲν ἀνειληφέναι, νοῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔχειν αὐτὴν, ἀλλ' εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἀντὶ νοῦ εἰς τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 46. [p. 164.] 'Nam et aliqui eorum fuisse in Christo animam negare non potuerunt. Videte absurditatem et insaniam non ferendam. Animam irrationalem eum habere voluerunt, rationalem negaverunt: dederunt ei animam pecoris, subtraxerunt hominis.' *S. August. Tract.* 47. *in Joan.* [§. 8. vol. iii. part ii. p. 611 B.] This was so properly indeed the Apollinarian heresy, that it was thereby distinguished from the Arian. 'Nam Apollinaristæ quidem carnis et animæ naturam sine mente adsumpsisse Dominum credunt; Ariani vero carnis tantummodo.' *Facun. lib.* ix. *cap.* 3. [p. 762 C.]

78 Some of the ancient Fathers did believe that the word ᾅδης in the Scriptures had the same signification which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the souls both of the wicked and the just; and so they took *Infernus* in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assign one ᾅδης for all which died, Πάντας ὁμῶς θνητοὺς εἷς

both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God,

ἀϊδης δέχεται· and Εἰς κοινὸν ᾄδην πάντες ἥξουσιν βροτοί· as they made within that one ᾅδης two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust, (according to that of Diphilus, *apud Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* v. [c. 14. vol. ii. p. 721.]

Καὶ γὰρ καθ' ᾅδην δύο τρίβους νομίζομεν·

Μίαν δικαίων· χἀτέραν ἀσεβῶν ὁδόν·

and that of Plato, Οὗτοι δὲ δὴ ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσωσι, δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἧς φέρετον τὼ ὁδὼ, ἡ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἡ δὲ εἰς τάρταρον· *In Gorgia* [p. 524 A.]: and that of Virgil;

Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas:
Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit;
Hac iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, et ad impia Tartara mittit; Æneid. vi. 540.)

as they did send the best of men to ᾅδης, there to be happy, and taught rewards to be received there as well as punishments, (Λέγεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ μελικοῦ Πινδάρου ταυτὶ περὶ τῶν εὐσεβέων ἐν ᾅδου,

Τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου
Τὰν ἐνθάδε νυκτὰ κάτω·
Φοινικοροδίαι τε λειμῶνές
Εἰσι προάστειον αὐτῶν.

Plutarch. de Consolat. ad Apollon. [vol. ii. p. 120 B.]

——— Ὦ τρισόλβιοι
Κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη
Μόλωσ' ἐς ᾅδου· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ
Ζῆν ἐστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακά·

Sophocl. apud Plutarch. de Aud. Poet.)

so did the Jews also before and after our Saviour's time. For Josephus says the soul of Samuel was brought up ἐξ ᾅδου, and delivers the opinion of the Pharisees after this manner, Ἀθάνατόν τε ἰσχὺν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς, εἶναι καὶ ὑπὸ χθόνος δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμὰς οἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτήδευσις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε· (Antiq. Jud. xviii. c. ii. §. 3.] and of the Sadducees after this manner, Ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν, καὶ τὰς καθ' ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. [De Bell. Jud. ii. 8. §. 14.] Therefore the Jews, which thought the souls immortal, did believe that the just were rewarded, as well as the unjust punished, ὑπὸ χθονός, or καθ' ᾅδου. And so did also most of the ancient Fathers of the Church. There was an ancient book written *de Universi Natura*, which some attributed to Justin Martyr, some to Irenæus, others to Origen, or to Caius a presbyter of the Roman Church in the time of Victor and Zephyrinus, a fragment of which is set forth by David Hœschelius in his Annotations upon Photius, delivering the state of ᾅδης at large. Περὶ δὲ ᾅδου, ἐν ᾧ συνέχονται ψυχαὶ δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων, ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν. Here then were the just and unjust in Hades, but not in the same place. Οἱ δὲ δ. καιοι—ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ νῦν μὲν συνέχονται, ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ, ᾧ καὶ οἱ ἄδικοι. Μία γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον κάθοδος, &c. There was but one passage into that Hades, saith he; but when that gate was passed, the just went on the right hand to a place of happiness, (Τούτῳ δὲ ὄνομα κικλήσκομεν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ,) and the unjust on the left to a place of misery, Οὗτος ὁ περὶ ᾅδου λόγος· ἐν ᾧ ψυχαὶ πάντων κατέχονται ἄχρι καιροῦ, ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ὥρισεν. Tertullian wrote a tract *de Paradiso*, now not extant, in which he expressed thus much: 'Habes etiam de Paradiso a nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud Inferos sequestrari in diem Domini.' *De Anim. cap.* 55. [p. 304 C.] St. Jerom on the third chapter of Ecclesiastes [vol. iii. p. 416 A.]: 'Ante adventum Christi omnia ad Inferos pariter ducebantur. Unde et Jacob ad Inferos descensurum se dicit; et Job pios et impios in Inferno queritur retentari: et Evangelium, Chaos magnum interpositum apud Inferos, et Abraham cum Lazaro, et divitem in suppliciis, esse testatur.' And in his 25th Epistle, 'Perfacilis ad ista responsio est; Luxisse Jacob filium, quem putabat occisum, ad quem et ipse erat ad Inferos descensurus, dicens, *Descendam ad filium meum lugens in Infernum:* quia necdum Paradisi januam Christus effregerat, necdum flammeam illam romphæam et vertiginem præsi-

the souls of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the people of God.

But others there were who thought *hades* or *infernus* was never taken in the Scriptures for any place of happiness[79]; and therefore they did not conceive the souls of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did pass into any such infernal place; and consequently, that the descent into hell was not his going to the Prophets or the Patriarchs, which were not there. For as, if it had been only said that Christ had gone unto the bosom of Abraham, or to Paradise, no man would ever have believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is only written, *Thou shalt* 240

dentium Cherubim sanguis ejus extinxerat. Unde et Abraham, licet in loco refrigerii, tamen apud Inferos cum Lazaro fuisse scribitur.' [Ep. xxxix. vol. i. p. 179 B.] And again, 'Nequeo satis Scripturæ laudare mysteria, et divinum sensum, in verbis licet simplicibus, admirari: quid sibi velit quod Moyses plangitur; et Jesus Nave, vir sanctus, sepultus refertur, et tamen fletus esse non scribitur. Nempe illud, quod in Moyse, id est, in Lege veteri, sub peccato Adam omnes tenebantur elogio; et ad Inferos descendentes consequenter lacrymæ prosequebantur—In Jesu vero, id est, in Evangelio, per quem Paradisus est apertus, mortem gaudia prosequuntur.' [Ibid. p. 179 F.] Τὸ πρότερον ὁ θάνατος εἰς τὸν ᾅδην κατῆγε· νυνὶ δὲ ὁ θάνατος πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν παραπέμπει. *S. Chrysost. Panegyr. in Sanctas Mart. Bern. et Prosd.* [§. 3. vol. ii. p. 638 B.] And in his tractate proving that Christ is God, he makes this exposition of Isaiah xlv. 2. Πύλας χαλκᾶς συνθλάσω, καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συντρίψω, καὶ ἀνοίξω σοι θησαυροὺς σκοτεινοὺς, ἀποκρύφους, ἀοράτους ἀναδείξω σοι· τὸν Ἅιδην οὕτω καλῶν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ᾅδης ἦν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὰς ἐκράτει ἁγίας καὶ σκεύη τίμια, τὸν Ἀβραὰμ, τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, τὸν Ἰακώβ· διὸ καὶ θησαυροὺς ἐκάλεσε. [vol. i. p. 564 D.] This doctrine was maintained by all those who believed that the soul of Samuel was raised by the Witch of Endor: for though he were so great a Prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades; and not only so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho: Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν οὕτως δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν, ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἔπιπτον τῶν τοιούτων δυνάμεων, ὁποῖα δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖται. §. 105. [p. 200 C.] Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius Antiochenus, and others.

79 St. Augustin began to doubt of that general reason ordinarily given of Christ's descent into hell, to bring the Patriarchs and Prophets thence, upon this ground, that he thought the word *Infernus* was never taken in the Scriptures with a good sense; 'Quanquam illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, *Inferos* appellatos, ubi justorum animæ requiescunt:' *De Genes. ad lit. lib.* xii. *cap.* 33. [§. 63. vol. iii. part i. p. 320 G.] 'Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, et adhuc quæro; nec mihi occurrit *Inferos* alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam, duntaxat canonicam.' *Ibid.* [§. 64. p. 321 C.] 'Non facile alicubi Scripturarum *Inferorum* nomen positum invenitur in bono.' *Epist.* 57. [Epist. CLXXXVII. 6. vol. ii. p. 679 G.] 'Præsertim quia ne ipsos quidem Inferos uspiam Scripturarum in bono appellatos potui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis auctoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est, secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars Inferorum esse credenda est. Quanquam in his ipsis tanti magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse Abraham, *Inter vos et nos chaos magnum firmatum est*, satis, ut opinor, appareat non esse quandam partem et quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis sinum. *Epist.* XCIX. *cap.* 3. [Epist. CLXIV. 7. p. 575 F.]

not leave my soul in hell, it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the Patriarchs who were not there.

Now this being the diversity of opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose souls the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of *hades* to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the souls of men (as well those which died in the favour of God, as those which departed in their sins), some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of *hades*[80], where the souls of all the faithful, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, were detained; and there dissolving all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place, and estated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above.

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still[81], and shall not enter into heaven until

80 This is the opinion generally received in the Schools, and delivered as the sense of the Church of God in all ages: but though it were not so general as the Schoolmen would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it. Ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ἐν ᾅδου ψυχῶν παρὴν ἐκ μακρῶν αἰώνων τὴν ἄφιξιν αὐτοῦ περιμενουσῶν. *Euseb. de Dem. Evang. lib.* x. *cap.* 8. [p. 501 B.] Κατῆλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἵνα κἀκεῖθεν λυτρώσηται τοὺς δικαίους. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* iv. *cap.* 11. [p. 57 B.] Ἤμελλε γὰρ ἡ θεότης τελειοῦν τὰ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ πάθους, καὶ σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ κατελθεῖν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἐπὶ τὸ ἐργάσασθαι τὴν ἐκεῖ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων σωτηρίαν, φημὶ τῶν ἁγίων πατριαρχῶν. 'Translatus erat Enoch, raptus Elias; sed non est servus supra dominum. Nullus enim ascendit in cœlum, nisi qui descendit de cœlo. Nam et Moysen, licet corpus ejus non apparuerit in terris, nusquam tamen in gloria cœlesti legimus, nisi postquam Dominus suæ resurrectionis pignore vincula solvit Inferni, et piorum animas elevavit.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib.* iv. *cap.* 1. [§. 8. vol. ii. p. 523 B.] 'Qui nunc vincti estis, et inmiti atque terribili Inferno tenemini; qui solutionem vinculorum in Christi speratis adventu, &c.' *S. Hieron. in Zach. cap.* 9. [vol. vi. p. 864 E.] 'Ab illis Inferi sedibus nullus homo merito suo liberatus est, nisi gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi.' *Idem, in Job. cap.* 36.* 'In typo præfigurat iste Angelus sive Filius Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui ad fornacem descendit Inferni, in quo clausæ, et peccatorum et justorum animæ tenebantur, ut absque exustione et noxa sui, eos qui tenebantur inclusi, mortis vinculis liberaret.' *Idem, in Dan. cap.* 3. [vol. v. p. 643 B.]——'Perfossum parietem, quo Infernorum claustra perfregit—.' *Idem, in Ezech. cap.* 12. [ib. p. 115 C.]—'Terram—mortuorum, quæ diripitur atque vastatur, quando morte Christi vinctæ apud Inferos animæ liberantur.' *Idem, in Oseam, cap.* 13. [vol. vi. p. 155 D.]

81 Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho first begins: Ἀλλὰ μὲν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ· ἔρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κα-

* [This is not the work of Jerom. See Op. vol. xi. p. 668 B.]

the general resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come 241

κοῖς· ἀλλὰ τί ; τὰς μὲν τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονί που χώρῳ μένειν, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκους καὶ πονηρὰς ἐν χείρονι, τὸν τῆς κρίσεως ἐκδεχομένας χρόνον τότε. §. 5. [p. 107 D.] After him Irenæus ; 'Cum Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, et post resurrectionem assumptus est ; manifestum est quia et discipulorum ejus, propter quos et hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum, definitum eis a Deo, et ibi usque ad resurrectionem commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem ; post recipientes corpora et perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corporaliter, quemadmodum et Dominus resurrexit, sic venient ad conspectum Dei. Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum ; perfectus autem omnis erit, sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum a Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus, (quod et per Jonam manifestatum est,) post triduum resurgens assumptus est ; sic et nos sustinere debemus definitum a Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus, prænuntiatum a Prophetis, et sic resurgentes assumi, quotquot Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. *Adv. Hæres. lib.* v. *cap.* 26. [c. 31. §. 2. p. 331.] Tertullian followeth Irenæus in this particular : 'Habes et regionem Inferum subterraneam credere, et illos cubito pellere, qui satis superbe non putant animas fidelium Inferis dignas ; servi super dominum, et discipuli super magistrum, aspernati si forte in Abrahæ sinu exspectandæ resurrectionis solatium capere.' *De Anim. cap.* 55. [p. 304 A.] 'Nulli patet cœlum, terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi reserabuntur regna cœlorum.' *Ibid.* 'Eam itaque regionem, sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen Inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 34. [p 450 D.] 'Omnes ergo animæ penes Inferos ? inquis. Velis ac nolis, et supplicia jam illic et refrigeria habes : paucum et divitem.—Cur enim non putes animam et puniri et foveri in Inferis, interim sub exspectatione utriusque judicii, in quadam usurpatione et candida ejus ?' *De Anim. cap.* 58. [p. 306 D.] St. Hilary, in his commentary upon these words of the Psalm, '*Dominus custodiet et introitum tuum et exitum tuum ex hoc et usque in sæculum:* Non enim temporis hujus et sæculi est ista custodia, non aduri sole atque luna, et ab omni malo conservari ; sed futuri boni exspectatio est, cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cœlestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interim Abrahæ collocati, quo adire impios interjectum chaos inhibet, quousque introeundi rursum in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat. Custodiet ergo Dominus exitum, dum de corpore exeuntes, secreti ab impiis interjecto chao quiescant. Custodit et introitum, nos in æternum illud et beatum regnum introducens.' *Tract. in Psalm.* cxx. [p. 383 D.] And at the end of the second Psalm, [p. 52.] 'Judicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio est æterna, vel pœnæ : tempus vero mortis habet interim unumquemque suis legibus, dum ad judicium unumquemque aut Abraham reservat aut pœna.' Thus Gregory Nyssen still leaves the Patriarchs in Abraham's bosom, in expectation of admittance into Heaven : Καὶ γὰρ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατριάρχαι τοῦ μὲν ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔσχον, καὶ οὐκ ἀνῆκαν ἐπιζητοῦντες τὴν ἐπουράνιον πατρίδα, καθώς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος· ἀλλ' ὁμῶς ἐν τῷ ἐλπίζειν ἔτι τὴν χάριν εἰσὶ, τοῦ Θεοῦ κρεῖττόν τι περὶ ἡμῶν προβλεψαμένου, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου φωνὴν, ἵνα μὴ, φησὶ, χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι. *De Hom. Opific. cap.* 22. [vol. i. p. 103 C.] These therefore which conceived that the souls of the godly, now after Christ's ascension, do go unto the bosom of Abraham, where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the general resurrection, did not believe that Christ did therefore descend into Hell, that he might translate the Patriarchs from thence into Heaven.

should be kept out from heaven till he came; and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

But such as thought the place in which the souls of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called *hell*, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper hell, or place of torment, so the end of his descent was to deliver souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of heretics[82]: but to believe that many

[82] St. Augustin in his book *de Hæresibus* reckons this as the seventy-ninth heresy: 'Alia, descendente ad Inferos Christo credidisse incredulos, et omnes exinde existimat liberatos.' [vol. viii. p. 23 D.] And though he gives the heresy without a name, as he found it in Philastrius, yet we find the opinion was not very singular. For Euodius propounded it to St. Augustin as a question in which he desired satisfaction, 'An descendens Christus omnibus evangelizavit, omnesque a tenebris et pœnis per gratiam liberavit, ut a tempore resurrectionis Domini judicium exspectetur, exinanitis Inferis?' *Epist.* 98. *ad S. August.* [Epist. CLXIII. vol. ii. p. 573 C.] And in his answer to that question, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an heresy, but as a doubtful proposition. His resolution, first, is, that it did not concern the Prophets and the Patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in Hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence: 'Addunt quidam hoc beneficium antiquis etiam Sanctis fuisse concessum, Abel, Seth, Noe, et domui ejus, Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob, aliisque Patriarchis et Prophetis, ut cum Dominus in Infernum venisset, illis doloribus solverentur. Sed quonam modo intelligatur Abraham, in cujus sinum pius etiam pauper ille susceptus est, in illis fuisse doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicant fortasse qui possunt.' *Epist.* xcix. *ad Euodium, cap.* 3. [Epist. CLXIV. 6. p. 575 D.] *Et paulo post:* 'Unde illis justis qui in sinu Abrahæ erant, cum ille in Inferna descenderet, nondum quid contulisset inveni, a quibus eum secundum beatificam præsentiam suæ divinitatis nunquam video recessisse.' [§. 8. p. 576 B.] And yet in another place he will not blame them that believed the contrary, nor did he think their opinion absurd. 'Si enim non absurde credi videtur, antiquos etiam Sanctos, qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remotissimis, sed apud Inferos, fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi et ad ea loca descensus erueret, &c.' *De Civit. Dei, lib.* xx. *cap.* 15. [vol. vii. p. 593 C.] His second resolution was, that Christ did by his descent relieve some out of the pains of Hell; taking Hell in the worst sense. 'Quia evidentia testimonia et Infernum commemorant et dolores, nulla causa occurrit, cur illo credatur venisse Salvator, nisi ut ab ejus doloribus salvos faceret.' *Epist.* xcix. *cap.* 3. [§. 8. vol. ii. p. 576 A.] 'Quamobrem teneamus firmissime quod fides habet fundatissima auctoritate firmata, *quia Christus mortuus est secundum Scripturas, et quia sepultus est, et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas:* et cætera quæ de illo, testatissima veritate, conscripta sunt. In quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud Inferos fuit, solutisque eorum doloribus, quibus eum erat impossibile teneri, a quibus etiam recte intelligitur solvisse et liberasse quos voluit.' *Ibid. cap.* 5. [§. 14. p. 578 F.] His third resolution was, that how many these were which were delivered out of

were delivered, was both by them and many others counted orthodox.

The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the souls of men from hell, was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to those souls by preaching of the Gospel there[83]: that as he revealed here on earth the will of

the torments of Hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. 'Sed utrum omnes quos in eis invenit, an quosdam quos illo beneficio dignos judicavit, adhuc requiro.' *Ibid. cap.* 3. [§. 8. p. 576 A.] 'Hoc scilicet quod scriptum est, *Solutis doloribus Inferni*, non in omnibus, sed in quibusdam accipi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberatione judicabat: ut neque frustra illuc descendisse existimetur, nulli eorum profuturus qui ibi tenebantur inclusi; nec tamen sit consequens, ut quod divina quibusdam misericordia justitiaque concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit.' *Ibid. cap.* 2. [§. 5. p. 575 B.] 'Potest et sic, ut eos dolores eum solvisse credamus, quibus teneri ipse non poterat, sed quibus alii tenebantur, quos ille noverat liberandos. Verum quinam isti sint, temerarium est definire. Si enim omnes omnino dixerimus tunc esse liberatos, qui illic inventi sunt, quis non gratuletur, si hoc possimus ostendere?' *Ibid. cap.* 2. [p. 574 D.] Thus the opinion of St. Augustin is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in happiness and the beatifical presence of God, and so needed no translation by the Descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of Hell, some were loosed and delivered from them, some were not: and this was the proper end or effect of Christ's Descent into Hell. Thus Capreolus; 'Ipse in homine est visitare Inferorum dignatus abstrusa, et præpositos mortis præsentia invictæ majestatis exterruit, et propter liberandos quos voluit, Inferorum portas reserari præcepit.' *Epist. ad Vital. et Constant.* [§. 4. p. 494 D.] St. Ambrose: 'Ipse autem inter mortuos liber, remissionem in Inferno positis, soluta mortis lege, donabat.' *De Incarn. cap.* 5. [§. 40. vol. ii. p. 712 D.] Ὅλον γὰρ εὐθὺς σκυλεύσας τὸν ᾅδην, καὶ τὰς ἀφύκτους τοῖς τῶν κεκοιμημένων πνεύμασιν ἀναπετάσας πύλας, ἔρημόν τε καὶ μόνον ἀφεὶς ἐκεῖσε τὸν διάβολον ἀνέστη. *S. Cyril. Homil. Pasch.* 7. [vol. v. pt. ii. p. 91 C.] who speaks full as high as those words of Euodius, or that heretic, whosoever it was, which is mentioned, though not named, by Philastrius: for ἔρημος καὶ μόνος διάβολος is as much as *Inferi exinaniti:* and κενώσας τοῦ θανάτου μυχόν (which he useth in another Homily) is the same.

83 This preaching of the Gospel to the dead was the general opinion of the Fathers, as the end of his descent, or means by which that good was wrought for the souls below, which was effected by his death. 'Propter hoc Dominum in ea, quæ sunt sub terra, descendisse, evangelizantem et illis adventum suum, remissione peccatorum exsistente his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui sperabant in eum, id est, qui adventum ejus prænuntiaverunt, et dispositionibus ejus servierunt, justi, et Prophetæ, et Patriarchæ; quibus similiter ut nobis remisit peccata.' *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iv. *cap.* 45. [c. 27. §. 2.] Ἐνεργεῖ δὲ, οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἐπεὶ τὸ σώζειν ἔργον αὐτοῦ· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ πεποίηκεν τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεῦσαι βεβουλημένους διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος, ὅποί ποτ' ἔτυχον γεγονότες, ἑλκύσας εἰς σωτηρίαν. Εἰ γ' οὖν ὁ Κύριος δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ᾅδου κατῆλθεν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ὥσπερ κατῆλθεν, ἤτοι πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους. Εἰ μὲν οὖν πάντας, σωθήσονται πάντες οἱ πιστεύσαντες, κἂν ἐξ ἐθνῶν ὄντες τύχωσιν, ἐξομολογησάμενοι ἤδη ἐκεῖ. *S. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 6. vol. ii. p. 763.] Τριήμερος γὰρ ἀνεβίω, κηρύξας καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι. Πληρεστάτη γὰρ οὕτως ἡ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐπίδειξις ἦν, τῷ μὴ μόνον ἀνασῶσαί φημι, τοὺς ἔτι ζῶντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἤδη κατοιχομένοις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀβύσσου μυχοῖς καθημένοις ἐν σκότῳ, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, διακηρύξαι τὴν ἄφεσιν. *S. Cyril. Alex. in Joan. cap.* xvi. *v.* 16. [lib. xi. c. 2. vol. iv. p. 933 B.]

God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die; so after his death he shewed himself unto the souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

242 Thus did they think the soul of Christ descended into hell to preach the Gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to affect the end, of Christ's descent: nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this Article, for many reasons. For first, I have already shewed that the place of St. Peter, so often mentioned for it, is not capable of that sense, nor hath it any relation to our Saviour after death. Secondly, the ancients seem upon no other reason to have interpreted this place of St. Peter in that manner, but because other apocryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion only can rely. A place of the Prophet Jeremy was first produced[84], that *The Lord God of Israel remembered his dead,*

Πολλαχοῦ διαμαρτύρεται ἡ γραφὴ, ὃν τρόπον τοῖς τηνικάδε ζῶσι, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδου διὰ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν παραγενέσθαι. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ τῶν μαθητῶν κορυφαῖος, Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ· καὶ πάλιν, Τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξε πνεύμασιν, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ πνεύματι· τουτέστιν, ὅπως οἱ μὲν ἄπιστοι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἁμαρτωλοὶ μεμενηκότες κατακριθῶσιν, ἅτε δὴ ὁλοκλήρως σὰρξ γεγονότες, καὶ διχοτομηθέντες τοῦ πνεύματος· ὅσοι δὲ κἂν ἐν ᾅδου Χριστῷ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ πεπιστεύκασι, τῆς πνευματικῆς εὐφροσύνης ἀπολαύωσι. *Jobius apud Phot.* [222.] *lib.* ix. *cap.* 38.

84 Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew; Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἱερεμίου ὁμοίως ταῦτα περιέκοψαν· Ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀναγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. §. 72. [p. 170 B.] This place is first brought by Irenæus, to prove that he which died for us was not only man, but God: 'Et quoniam non solum homo erat qui moriebatur pro nobis, Esaias ait, *Et commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, quia* (leg. *qui*) *dormierant in terra sepultionis, et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quæ est ab eo, ut salvaret eos.*' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 2[3]. [c. xx. §. 4. p. 214.] Only he names Isaiah instead of Jeremiah, whom he rightly names again; 'Sicut Hieremias ait, *Recommemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum,* &c.' *lib.* iv. *cap.* 39. [c. xxii. §. 1. p. 259.] and as there, so more plainly, *lib.* v. *cap.* 26. [c. xxxi. p. 330.] applies it to the soul of Christ while it was absent from his body; 'Nunc autem tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui, quemadmodum prophetia ait de eo, *Commemoratus est Dominus sanctorum* (leg. *sanctus Israel*) *mortuorum suorum, eorum qui ante dormierunt in terra stipulationis* (leg. *sepultionis*), *et descendit ad eos, extrahere eos, et salvare eos.*' Thus did Irenæus make use of this verse, to shew Christ preached unto the dead, rather than that of St.

which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them his salvation. But being there is no such verse extant in that Prophet or any other, it was also delivered that it was once in the translation of the Septuagint, but rased out from thence by the Jews: which as it can scarce be conceived true, so, if it were, it would be yet of doubtful authority, as being never yet found in the Hebrew Text. And Hermes in his book, called the Pastor, was thought to give sufficient strength to this opinion[85]; whereas the book itself is of no good authority, and in this particular is most extravagant: for he taught, that not only the soul of Christ, but also the souls of the Apostles, preached to the spirits below; that as they followed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in hell.

Nor is this only to be suspected in reference to those pre- 243
tended authorities which first induced men to believe it, and to make forced interpretations of Scripture to maintain it; but also

Peter; and yet there is no authority in it. For it is not to be found in the Hebrew text, and Justin Martyr charges the Jews only of rasing it out of the LXX: which how they could do out of those copies which were in the Christians' hands, is scarce intelligible; and yet it is not now to be found there.*

85 Clemens Alexandrinus first brings a strange place of Scripture to prove Christ's preaching in Hell; *Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 6. p. 762.] Διόπερ ὁ Κύριος εὐηγγελίσατο καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδου. Φησὶ γ' οὖν ἡ γραφὴ, Λέγει ὁ ᾅδης τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ, Εἶδος μὲν αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἴδομεν, φωνὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἠκούσαμεν· which he thus interprets; Οὐχ ὁ τόπος δήπου φωνὴν λαβὼν, εἶπεν τὰ προειρημένα, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ᾅδου καταταγέντες καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες, καθάπερ ἔκ τινος νεὼς εἰς θάλασσαν ἑκόντες ἀπορρίψαντες· αὐτοὶ τοίνυν εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπακούσαντες τῆς θείας δυνάμεώς τε καὶ φωνῆς· and then seeming to aim at the place of St. Peter, he passes to another proof, which he had produced in his second book: Δέδεικται δὲ κἂν τῷ δευτέρῳ Στρωματεῖ, τοὺς Ἀποστόλους, ἀκολούθως τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τοὺς ἐν ᾅδου εὐηγγελισμένους· which he there proved by the authority of the book called *Pastor*, and attributed to Hermes; Ὁ Ποιμὴν δὲ— φησὶ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους καὶ διδασκάλους, τοὺς κηρύξαντας τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ κοιμηθέντας, τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τῇ πίστει κηρύξαι τοῖς προκεκοιμημένοις· *Strom. lib.* ii. [c. 9. vol. i. p. 452.] which words are thus in the old Latin translation of Hermes; 'Quoniam hi Apostoli et doctores qui prædicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum habentes fidem ejus et potestatem defuncti essent, prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt.' *Lib.* iii. *Simil.* 9. [c. 16. p. 120.] And then Clemens supplies that authority with a reason of his own, that as the Apostles were to imitate Christ while they lived, so did they also imitate him after death: Ἐχρὴν γὰρ, οἶμαι, ὥσπερ κἀνταῦθα, οὕτως δὲ κἀκεῖσε, τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν μαθητῶν μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τοῦ διδασκάλου· *Strom. lib.* vi. [c. 6. vol. ii. p. 763.] and therefore they preached to the souls in Hell, as Christ did before them. This is the doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus out of his apocryphal authorities.

* [There is added in the first edition, "And if it ever were, as many additional "patches have been in that translation, it could be of no authority, having no "foundation in the original."]

to be rejected in itself, as false, and inconsistent with the nature, scope, and end of the Gospel (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those only which are in this life), and as incongruous to the state and condition of those souls to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all saints before departed, it is certain they were never *disobedient in the days of Noah;* nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of Christ, who by virtue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptation had received a reward long before. If we look upon them which died in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preached. The rich man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, lest they also should come unto that place: but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who *heard not Moses and the Prophets, would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead;* surely those which had been disobedient unto the Prophets, should never be persuaded after they were dead. Luke xvi. 31.

Whether therefore we consider the authorities first introducing this opinion, which were apocryphal; or the testimonies of Scripture, forced and improbable; or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the Gospel; or the persons to whom Christ should be thought to preach (which, if dead in the faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction; if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation); this preaching of Christ *to the spirits in prison* cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end, of his descent into hell.

Nor is this preaching only to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Christ's descent; but the effect itself pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the ancients thought, as is shewn before, that Christ did therefore descend into hell, that he might deliver the souls of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of happiness; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which it is

built, nor in respect of the action or effect itself. The authority upon which the strength of this doctrine doth rely, is that place
Acts ii. 24. of the Acts, *whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of hell,* for so they read it; from whence the argument is thus deduced: God did loose the pains of hell when Christ was raised: but those pains did not take hold of Christ himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death; and consequently he could not be loosed from or taken out of those pains in which he never was: in the same manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the saints of old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called *hell,* yet were they there in happiness, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of hell: it followeth then, that those alone which died in their sins were involved in those pains, and when those pains were loosed, then were they released; and being they were loosed when Christ was raised, the consequence will be, that he, descending into hell, delivered some of the damned souls from their torments there.

But first, though the Latin translation render it so[86], *the* 244
pains of hell; though some copies and other translations, and divers of the Fathers, read it in the same manner; yet the original and authentic Greek acknowledgeth no such word as *hell,* but propounds it plainly thus, *whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of death.* Howsoever if the words were so expressed in the original text, yet it would not follow that God delivered Christ out of those pains in which he was detained any time, much less that the soul of Christ delivered the souls

86 The Vulgar Latin renders it thus, *Quem Deus suscitavit, solutis doloribus Inferni:* so also the Syriac, ישרא חבליה דשיול. So some of the ancient Fathers read it; as Irenæus, or rather his Interpreter, 'Quem Deus excitavit, solutis doloribus Inferorum:' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 12. Capreolus bishop of Carthage, 'Resolvere, sicut scriptum est, Inferorum parturitiones:' *Epist. ad Vital. et Constant.* [§. 4.] and before these Polycarpus—Ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου· *Quem resuscitavit Deus, dissolvens dolores Inferni: Epist. ad Phil.* [c. i. p. 186.] whom I suppose Grotius understood, when he cited Barnabas: and thus St. Augustin read it, and laid the stress of his interpretation upon this reading; 'Quia evidentia testimonia et Infernum commemorant et dolores, &c.' *Epist.* xcix. *cap.* 3. [Epist. CLXIV. 8. vol. ii. p. 576 A.] But in the original Greek it is generally written ὠδῖνας θανάτου, and in all these many copies of it, only that of Petrus Fraxardus, and two of the sixteen copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it ᾅδου. And this mistake was very easy: for in the eighteenth Psalm, verse the fourth, there is חבלי־מות ὠδῖνες θανάτου, and verse the fifth, חבלי שאול, ὠδῖνες ᾅδου. And we find twice in the Proverbs, xiv. 12. and xvi. 25. דרכי־מות translated πυθμένα ᾅδου, and 2 Sam. xxii. 6. חבלי שאול ὠδῖνες θανάτου.

of any other; but only that he was preserved from enduring them[87].

Again, as the authority is most uncertain, so is the doctrine most incongruous. The souls of men were never cast into infernal torments, to be delivered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the devils were saved, as those souls which were once tormented with them. For it is an *everlasting fire*, an *everlasting punishment*, a *worm* that *dieth not*. Nor does this only belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and eternal, but before that death it were not so; as if faith and repentance were now indispensably necessary to salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour came into the world, should have been far more happy and advantageous than it hath been since[88]. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternal flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the jaws of death. (*We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body;*) but if they be in the state of salvation now by virtue of Christ's descent into hell, which were numbered amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the general judgment they must be returned into hell again; or if they be received then into eternal happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men

Matt. xxv. 41, 46. Mark ix. 44.

2 Cor. v. 10.

87 'Quod si movet, quemadmodum accipiendum sit Inferni ab illo solutos dolores (neque enim cœperat in eis esse tanquam in vinculis, et sic eos solvit tanquam si catenas solvisset quibus fuerat alligatus): facile est intelligere sic eos solutos esse quemadmodum solvi possunt laquei venantium, ne teneant; non quia tenuerunt.' *S. August. Epist.* xcix. *cap.* 2. [§. 3. p. 574 C.]

88 This is the argument of Gregory the Great; 'Si fideles nunc sine bonis operibus non salvantur, et infideles ac reprobi sine bona actione, Domino ad Inferos descendente, salvati sunt; melior illorum sors fuit, qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam horum qui post incarnationis ejus mysterium nati sunt. Quod quantæ fatuitatis sit dicere vel sentire, ipse Dominus testatur discipulis, dicens, *Multi Reges et Prophetæ cupierunt videre quæ vos videtis, et non viderunt.*' *Lib.* vii. *Epist.* xv. [vol. ii. p. 862 A.]

to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. 'He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before, as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into hell, was not to deliver any damned souls, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joys of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by virtue of his descent 245
the souls of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before; and whether Christ *descended into hell* to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later ages of the Church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; he delivered not the souls of the damned, therefore he delivered the souls of them which believed, and of them alone[89]: till at last the schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of faith and infallible certainty[90], that the soul of Christ by descending into hell did deliver from thence all the

89 So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released by Christ's descent, thus infers and concludes: 'Hæc itaque omnia pertractantes nihil aliud teneatis nisi quod vera fides per Catholicam Ecclesiam docet: quia descendens ad Inferos Dominus illos solummodo ab Inferni claustris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam in fide et bona operatione servavit.' *Lib.* vii. *Epist.* xv. [p. 862 B.] So Isidore Hispalensis by way of opposition; 'Ideo Dominus in Inferno descendit, ut his, qui ab eo non pœnaliter detinebantur, viam aperiret revertendi ad cœlos.' *Sentent. lib.* i. *cap.* 16. [p. 420 E.] So Venerable Bede upon the place of St. Peter; 'Catholica fides habet, quia descendens ad Inferna Dominus non incredulos inde, sed fideles tantummodo suos educens, ad cœlestia secum regna perduxerit; neque exutis corpore animabus, et Inferorum carcere inclusis, sed in hac vita vel per seipsum, vel per suorum exempla, sive verba fidelium, quotidie viam vitæ demonstret.' [vol. v. p. 981.]

90 These are the words of Suarez; 'Primo ergo certum est, Christum descendendo ad Inferos animabus sanctis, quæ in sinu Abrahæ erant, essentialem beatitudinem, et cætera animæ dona, quæ illam consequuntur, contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo: quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem—Deinde est de fide certum, Christum per mortem aperuisse hominibus januam regni—ideoque de fide etiam certum est, animas sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decedentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum: ergo idem est de prædictis animabus.' *Com. in tertiam partem D. Thomæ. tom.* ii. *Disp.* 43. *sect.* 3.

souls of the saints which were in the bosom of Abraham, and did confer upon them actual and essential beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds: first, that the souls of saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The most ancient of all the Fathers[91], whose writings are extant, were so far from believing that the end of Christ's descent into hell was to translate the saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ's death, until the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shewn, thought the bosom of Abraham was not in any place which could be termed *hell;* and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that Christ delivered the Patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the Patriarchs were, and
246 doubted whether all were not so saved or no[92]. Indeed I think

91 We have shewed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient, producing the express testimonies of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen. So also Novatian; 'Quæ infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis et ordinatis potestatibus vacua. Locus enim est, quo piorum animæ impiorumque ducuntur futuri judicii præjudicia sentientes.' *Lib. de Trin. cap.* 1. [p. 767 C.]

92 We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned souls were saved then; and St. Augustin had his *adhuc requiro,* when he wrote unto Euodius concerning that opinion. Beside, the doubt of that great divine, Gregory Nazianzen, is very observable, who in his second Oration *de Paschate* hath these words; Ἂν εἰς ᾅδου κατίῃ, συγκάτελθε· γνῶθι καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστήρια· τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τῆς διπλῆς καταβάσεως; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἁπλῶς σάζει πάντας ἐπιφανείς, ἢ κἀκεῖ τοὺς πιστεύοντας; [Orat. xlv. §. 24. vol. i. p. 864 E.] where his question is clearly this, whether Christ appearing in Hell did save all without exception, or did save there, as he does here, only such as believed. To this it is answered by Suarez two ways, that it is the ordinary and universal law, that none of the damned should be saved: 'An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate et arbitrio aliquem damnatum a Gehenna Christus eduxerit, dubitari quoquo modo potest —Et juxta hæc possent intelligi Nazianzenus et Augustinus.' But this will by no means salve their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some only: which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence with another answer; 'Quanquam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut propo-

there were very few (if any) for above five hundred years after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the saints out of hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

And if the authority of this opinion in respect of its antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For first, if it be not certain that the souls of the Patriarchs were in some place called *hell* after their own death, and until the death of Christ; if the bosom of Abraham were not some infernal mansion, then can it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the souls of the just, the Patriarchs, and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called *hell:* the bosom of Abraham might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the Devil and his angels were; the Scriptures nowhere tell us that the spirits of just men went unto or did remain in hell; the place in which the rich man was in torments after death is called *hell*, but that into which the angels carried the poor man's soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two; nor is it likely that the angels, which see the face of God, should be sent down from heaven to convey the souls of the just into that place, where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated Enoch, and Elias was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that Moses was with Elias as well before as upon the mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that Abraham should be in any worse place or condition than Enoch was, having as great a
Heb. xi. 5. *testimony that he pleased God,* as Enoch had.

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the soul of Christ delivered the souls of the saints of old from hell, and imparted to them the beatifical vision, except it were certain that those souls are in another place and a better condition now than they were before.

neret quid de hoc mysterio inquirere ac scire oporteat.' Which is as much as to say, that he was satisfied of the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas it is clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have before shewn, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undetermined. And as for the other, 'Augustinus recte potest intelligi de animabus Purgatorii,' it is certainly false, unless they will enlarge that Purgatory as wide as Hell; for the question was of emptying that. *Com. in tertiam partem D. Thomæ Disp.* 43. *sect.* 3.

But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition than they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. *Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven:* there then did the Gentiles which came in to Christ find the Patriarchs, even in the kingdom of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else than Lazarus did. For the description is the same, *There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you* yourselves *thrust out.* For as the rich man *in hell lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off,* before the death of Christ; so those that were in *weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the Prophets,* when the Gentiles were brought in.

Matt. viii. 11. Luke xiii. 28. Luke xvi. 23.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the souls of the saints had been in a place called *hell,* as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition than they were before Christ's death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ *descended into hell* to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his resurrection, it might not be effected till his ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might have no dependence on his descension. I
247 conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that proposition which the schoolmen take for a matter of faith, That Christ delivered the souls of the saints from that place of hell which they call *Limbus of the Fathers,* into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerful and effectual for the redemption of the saints before him, as for those which follow him; being *they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink;* being Abraham is the *father of us all,* and we now after Christ's ascension are called but *to walk in the steps of the faith* of that father; being the bosom of Abraham is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed angels before the death of Christ conveyed the souls of those

1 Cor. x. 3, 4. Rom. iv. 12, 16.

which departed in the favour of God, and is also promised to them which should believe in Christ after his death[93]; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still to us that we shall go to him[94]; and, while we hope so, never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christ's descent into hell, to convey the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.*

Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour *descended into hell,* was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of Fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two; *Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them:* and, *When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts*

Col. ii. 15.

Eph. iv. 8, 9.

93 Although the *bosom of Abraham* in express and formal terms be spoken only of Lazarus, whom Christ being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same bosom is virtually and in terms equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joys of the life to come are likened to a feast, in which, according to the custom then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lie in his bosom, as we read of St. John, ἦν ἀνακείμενος—ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. St. John xiii. 23. Thus in that heavenly feast in the kingdom of God, Lazarus is ἐν τοῖς κόλποις Ἀβραάμ· St. Luke xvi. 23; and in St. Matt. viii. 11. Christ saith, that *many shall come from the east and from the west,* καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ, *discumbent cum Abrahamo, sit down with Abraham,* as we translate it after our custom, at the same feast, that is, ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, &c. as Euthymius, 'Quia Deus Abraham, cœli conditor, Pater Christi est; idcirco in regno cœlorum est et Abraham, cum quo accubituræ sunt nationes quæ crediderunt in Christum filium Creatoris.'

94 St. Augustin often shews the comfort which he had in going to the bosom of Abraham: as in the case of his friend Nebridius; 'Nunc ille vivit in sinu Abraham. Quicquid illud est quod illo significatur sinu, ibi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem, Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius, ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animæ locus?' *Confess. lib.* ix. *cap.* 3. §. 6. [vol. i. p. 159 B.] And he seats that place (as uncertain as before) where it was before. 'Post vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt sancti, quibus dicetur, *Venite benedicti Patris mei, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est ab initio mundi.* Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam poteris ibi esse, ubi illum quondam ulcerosum pauperem, dives ille superbus et sterilis in mediis suis tormentis vidit a longe requiescentem.' *Concio.* i. *in Psal.* 36. [§. 10. vol. iv. p. 263 C.] And this he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seats that place 'in conspectu Domini,' *De Civit. Dei, lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [vol. vi. p. 13 D.], and looked upon them which were in it, as upon those 'a quibus [Christus] secundum beatificam præsentiam suæ divinitatis nunquam recessit.' *Epist.* xcix. [al. clxiv.] *cap.* 3. [§. 8. vol. i. p. 576 B.]

unto men. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christ's descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were *buried with Christ in baptism, with whom ye were also raised: and when ye were dead in sins, he quickened you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us,* and *spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself.* That is, say they, ye died and were buried with Christ, who fastened the handwriting of ordinances to the cross, that he might abolish it from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickened, and raised together with Christ, who rising spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, *spoiling principalities and*
248 *powers,* are not referred to the cross, but to Christ's resurrection. This triumph over Satan and all his kingdom, the same Apostle to the Ephesians setteth down as a consequent to Christ's death, and pertinent to his resurrection, *Ascending on high he led captivity captive:* and this, *He ascended, what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* So that ascending from the lower parts of the earth he *led captivity captive,* which is all one with, he *triumphed over powers and principalities.* With this coherence and conjunction of the Apostle's words, together with the interpretation of the ancient Fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated, that Christ after his death, and before his resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, even in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

B. Bilson, p. 294. Col. ii. 12, 13, 14, 15. Eph. iv. 8, 9.

But notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in itself, or how it can have any consistency with the denial of those other ends, which they who of late have embraced this opinion do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the Scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the Fathers, who believe not that any of the souls of the damned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the souls of the saints of old were removed from thence by Christ's descent; which were the reasons why the Fathers spake of such a triumphing in hell, and leading captivity captive there.

That the triumphing in the Epistle to the Colossians is not referred to the cross but to the resurrection, cannot be proved; the coherence cannot enforce so much: no logic can infer such a division, that the *blotting out of the handwriting* belongeth precisely to our *burial with him;* and the *triumphing over principalities and powers* particularly to our being *quickened together with him;* or that the *blotting out* was performed at one time, and the *triumphing* at another. Our present translation attributeth it expressly to the cross, rendering the last words, *triumphing over them in it,* that is, in the cross mentioned in the former verse; and though anciently it have been read, *triumphing over them in himself*[95], yet still there are these two great advantages on our side: first, that if we read, *in it,* it proves the triumph spoken of in this place performed upon the cross; and if we read, *in himself,* it proveth not that the triumph was performed in any other place, because he was himself upon the cross: secondly, the ancient Fathers of the Greek Church read it as we do, *in it*[96], and interpret the triumph of his death; and

[95] So the Vulgar Latin, *Palam triumphans illos in semetipso;* as also the Syriac, בקנומה. So Novatian; *Triumphatis illis in semetipso. De Trin. cap.* 16. [p. 717 A.] St. Hilary; *Triumphans eos in semetipso.* [p. 553 G.] So Ambrose, Augustin, and Pacianus.

[96] Œcumenius sheweth their reading, Θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ, and interpretation, Θρίαμβος λέγεται ἡ κατὰ τῶν ἡττωμένων πόμπη καὶ πανήγυρις. Ἐθριάμβευσεν οὖν αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τουτέστιν, ἐνίκησε, καὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ θρίαμβον νοητὸν ἐπετέλεσε. *Com. in Epist. ad Coloss. cap.* vii. [vol. ii. p. 133 C.] Ἐν αὐτῷ then is διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, and this θρίαμβος νοητός on the cross will no way agree with that actual triumph in Hell. But Theophylact yet more clearly; Θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ· τουτέστιν, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοὺς δαίμονας ἡττημένους δείξας. Θρίαμβος γὰρ λέγεται, ὅταν τις ἀπὸ νίκης πολεμίων ἐπανελθὼν, δημοσίαν πομπὴν τελῇ, τοὺς ἡττηθέντας δεσμίους πᾶσι δεικνύων. Ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ οὖν τὸ τρόπαιον στήσας ὁ Κύριος, ὥσπερ ἐν δημοσίῳ θεάτρῳ Ἕλλήνων, Ῥωμαίων, Ἰουδαίων, τοὺς δαίμονας ἐθριάμβευσε. *In loco.* [p. 653.] And this exposition they received from St. Chrysostom, who makes the δειγματισμός on the cross to consist in the death upon it; Ἐκεῖ τὴν πληγὴν ἔλαβεν ὁ διάβολος, ὑπὸ σώματος νεκροῦ τὴν καιρίαν λαβών. *In Epist. ad Coloss. Homil.* 6. [§. 3. vol. xi. p. 368 D.] where it is to be observed, that the triumph is not attributed to the soul departed from the body and descended into Hell, but rather to the body left by the soul and hanging on the cross; Διὰ τοῦ οἰκείου σώματος πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν χαρισάμενος νίκην, says Theodoret *in loco.* [vol. iii. p. 354 C.] And before all these Origen most expressly; 'Visibiliter quidem Filius Dei in carne crucifixus est: invisibiliter vero in ea cruce diabolus cum principatibus suis et potestatibus affixus est cruci. Non tibi hoc videbitur verum, si tibi horum testem produxero Apostolum Paulum? —*Quod erat,* inquit, *contrarium nobis, tulit illud de medio, affigens cruci suæ, exuens principatus et potestates traduxit, libere triumphans eas in ligno crucis.*— Ergo duplex ratio Dominicæ crucis; una illa, qua dicit Petrus quod Christus crucifixus *nobis reliquit exemplum;* et hæc secunda, qua crux illa trophæum de diabolo fuit, in quo et crucifixus est et triumphatus.' *Homil.* 8. *in Josuam.* [§. 3. vol. ii. p. 416 A.] 'Requievit ut leo, cum in cruce positus principatus et

those others of the Latin Church, which did read it otherwise, did also acknowledge with the Greeks the cross not only to be the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained, but also to be the trophy of that victory, and the triumphal chariot[97].

249 This place then of St. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ *descended into hell*, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpose of itself, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For, first, we have already shewn, that the *descending* into the *lower parts of the earth*, doth not necessarily signify his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted, that those words did signify *hell*, and this Article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that Scripture, that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be only this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive, *descended* first *into hell*. *In that he ascended*, (and ascending led captivity captive,) *what is it but that he descended*

potéstates exuit, et triumphavit eos cum ligno crucis.' *Idem.*

97 Tertullian;

Serpentis spolium, devicto principe mundi,
Affixit ligno, refugarum immane trophœum.

Adv. Marcion. lib. ii. [amongst the works of Tertullian, p. 632.]

Prudentius;

Dic tropœum passionis, dic triumphalem crucem.

Cathem. Hymn. ix. ver. 83.

St. Hilary most expressly; '*Manus* ejus *edoctæ ad bellum* sunt cum sæculum vincit. *Ego enim*, ait, *vici mundum*, cum extensus in crucem invictissimis armis ipsius passionis instruitur. *Et posuisti*, inquit, *ut arcum æreum brachia mea*, eum de omnibus virtutibus ac potestatibus, in ipso se, trophæo gloriosæ crucis triumphat, et principatus ut potestates *traduxit cum fiducia triumphans eos in semetipso.*' *Tract. in Psal.* 143. [p. 553 F.] Where it is observable that the Father does read it *in semetipso*, and interprets it *in cruce*. 'Nos quoniam trophæum jam videmus, et quod currum suum triumphator ascendit, consideremus quod non arborum, non quadrijugis plaustri manubias de mortali hoste quæsitas; sed patibulo triumphali captiva de sæculo spolia suspendit. *S. Ambros. lib.* x. *in cap.* 23. *S. Lucæ* [§. 109. vol. i. p. 1527 C.]; and amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards 'captivum principem mundi, et spiritualia nequitiæ quæ sunt in cœlestibus.' To this alludes Fulgentius; 'Sic oportuit nostrorum peccatorum deleri chirographum, ut dum vetus homo noster simul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo, triumphatoris victoria panderetur.' *Ad Thrasim. lib.* iii. *cap.* 29. [p. 135.] Whether therefore we read it ἐν αὐτῷ, with the Greeks, that is, ἐν σταυρῷ, or ἐν αὑτῷ, with the Latins, *in seipso*, it is the same: for he triumphed over the Devil by himself upon the cross, as in the same case it is written, Eph. ii. 16. Καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ.

first? The descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person; and that is all which the Apostle's words will evince. Nay farther yet, the ascent mentioned by St. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the descent into hell, for it evidently signifieth the ascension which followed forty days after his resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an *ascending up on high,* even *far above all heavens.* Now the *leading captivity captive* belongeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said, that he *descended first* to *lead captivity captive;* and yet it must be so, if Christ descended into hell to triumph there: it is not said, when he had *led captivity captive, he ascended up on high;* for then it might be supposed that the captives had been led before: but it is expressly said, *ascending up on high he led captivity captive*[98]; and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be proved than this, that Christ triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the cross, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven. Which is so far from proving that Christ descended into hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to persuade the contrary. For why should he go to hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the cross? Why should he go to [lead] captive that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into heaven?

As for the testimonies of the Fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the saints to heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of hell. In vain shall we pretend that Christ *descended into hell* to lead captivity captive, if we withal maintain, that when he de- 250
scended thither he brought none away which were captive there.

98 The original words do manifestly shew that this triumphant act did not precede this ascent; for had it been Αἰχμαλωτεύσας αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, we might well have expounded it thus; Christ did lead Sin and Death and Satan captive; and when he had done so, ascended up on high; but being it is written Ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος, that is, *having ascended up on high,* ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, *he captivated a captivity,* the ascent must here precede the captivation, though not in time (as it did the giving of gifts) yet in nature: so that it is not proper to say, by captivating he ascended; but it is proper to express it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity.

This was the very notion which those Fathers had[99], that the souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the soul of Christ descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil hell, and lead captive captivity, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no souls from thence, he had not spoiled hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the Fathers' sense. Wherefore, being the Scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in hell; being the triumph which the Fathers mention, was either in relation to the damned souls which Christ took out of those tormenting flames, as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those

[99] So St. Jerom on that place of the Ephesians; 'Inferiora autem terræ, Infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut sanctorum animas, quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cœlos victor abduceret.' [vol. vii. p. 613 E.] And on Matt. xii. 29. 'Alligatus est fortis, et religatus in Tartarum, et Domini contritus pede; et direptis sedibus tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas.' [ib. p. 80 E.] So Arnoldus Carnotensis is to be understood; 'Passus est rex illudi, et vita occidi; descendensque ad Inferos captivam ab antiquo captivitatem reduxit;' *De Unctione Chrismatis;* [in the Appendix to S. Cyprian, p. cxxvi.] applying it to the custom of the Church, 'Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab Inferis, reconciliati peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur.' *Ibid.* Thus Athanasius, when he speaks of Christ's triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions *τὸν ᾅδην σκυλευθέντα, Hell spoiled*, to wit, of those souls which before it kept in hold. Otherwise in the same oration*, *in Passionem et Crucem* [§. 20. vol. ii. p. 96 C.], he acknowledgeth the triumph on the cross; *Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν νικητὴν τὸν θριαμβεύοντα* (not *θριαμβεύσοντα*) *κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου, μὴ ἄλλῳ συγχωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτῷ βαστάζειν τὸ τρόπαιον.* Thus Leo the Emperor; *Χριστὸς ἀνέστη τὸν ᾅδην αἰχμαλωτίσας, καὶ τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις ἐλευθερίαν κηρύξας. Homil. de Resur.* [p. 1691 B.] And thus Macarius supposeth Christ victoriously speaking unto Hell and Death, *Κελεύω σοὶ ᾅδη καὶ σκότος, καὶ θάνατε, ἔκβαλε τὰς ἐγκεκλεισμένας ψυχάς. Homil.* 11. [p. 42 B.] *Auctor Libelli de Paschate*, under the name of St. Ambrose; 'Expers peccati Christus, cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, seras Inferni januasque confringens, vinctas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, e diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam: atque ita divinus triumphus æternis characteribus est conscriptus, dum dicit, *Ubi est, mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, mors, victoria tua?*' *cap.* 4. [§. 5. vol. ii. App. p. 437 E.] And the Commentaries under the same name; 'Gratia Dei abundavit in descensu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho sublatis eis in cœlum.' *Ad Rom. cap.* v. *v.* 15. [vol. ii. App. p. 57 D.] 'Secundum animam descendit ad Inferna et spoliavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum.' *Ecbert. Serm.* 9. *cont. Catharos.* [c. 2. p. 466 E.] Thus still the Fathers which speak of spoiling Hell, of leading captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be understood in respect to those souls which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession, or dominion of Satan, whether just or unjust.

* [It is most probably spurious.]

infernal habitations, as others did conceive; being we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the effect of Christ's descent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this as the proper end of the Article.

Nor can we see how the Prophet David could intend so much, as if, when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, he should have intended this, Thou shalt not leave my soul separated from my body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers of hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the prisoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In sum, those words of the Prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant, and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body, that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of itself free the body from corruption; so the hope that his soul should not be left in hell, supposeth it not to be in such a state as was of itself contradictory to dereliction.

And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the Prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shewn the substance of the Article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, did truly pass unto the places below, where the souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so was, that he might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinful flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his soul was conveyed into such 251
receptacles as the souls of other persons use to be. All, which was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the cross; and all, which was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected upon and after his resurrection: in the interim therefore there is nothing left, at least known to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This he undertook to do, and did: and though the ancient Fathers by the several additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be

sufficiently observed in their writings[1], and is certainly most conformable to that prophetical expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explication, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.*

Secondly, by the descent of Christ into hell, all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither: he went unto those regions of darkness, that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our fears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan had taken up

[1] Irenæus so calls his Descent, 'Legem mortuorum servare;' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* v. *cap.* 26. [c. 31. §. 2. p. 331.], and St. Hilary expresses that which I intend very clearly; 'Morte non interceptus est unigenitus Dei Filius; ad explendam quidem hominis naturam, etiam morti se, id est, discessioni se tanquam animæ corporisque subjecit, et ad Infernas sedes, id quod homini debitum videtur esse, penetravit.' *Tract. in Psal.* 53. [p. 101.] And before him Tertullian; 'Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum Scripturas, et sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud Inferos functus.' *De Anim. cap.* 55. [p. 304 A.] Ἦλθεν αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν πάντων Σωτὴρ, καὶ τὰς ἡμῖν χρεωστουμένας τιμωρίας εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἡμῶν, ἀνθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἀναμάρτητον αὐτοῦ ὑπεδέξατο σάρκα. Καταφερόμεθα κατὰ τὸν θάνατον εἰς τὸν ᾅδην· ἀνεδέξατο καὶ τοῦτο, καὶ κατῆλθεν ἑκουσίως εἰς αὐτόν. *Gelas. Act. Concil. lib.* ii. *cap.* 24. This St. Austin calls 'proprietatem carnis:' 'Scio ad Inferos Divinitatem Filii Dei descendisse proprietate carnis, scio ad cœlum ascendisse carnem merito Deitatis:' *Cont. Felician. c.* 11.* and afterwards he calls it 'Injuriam carnis:' 'Erat uno atque eodem tempore ipse totus etiam in Inferno, totus in cœlo; illic patiens injuriam carnis, hic non relinquens gloriam Deitatis.' *Cap.* 14. [p. 47 D.] 'Impleta est Scriptura quæ dicit, *Et cum iniquis reputatus est.* Quod et altius intelligi potest, dicente de semetipso Domino, *Reputatus sum cum descendentibus in lacum: factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber.* Vere enim reputatus est inter peccatores et iniquos, ut descenderet ad Infernum.' *S. Hieron. in Isaiæ cap.* liii. *v.* 12. [vol. iv. p. 624 C.] Ruffinus, in his Exposition of the Creed [§. 30. p. ccxix.], descanting upon that place in the Psalms, '*Factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber;* Non dixit *homo*, sed *sicut homo. Sicut homo* enim erat, quia etiam descenderat in Infernum; sed *inter mortuos liber* erat, quia a morte teneri non poterat. Et ideo in uno natura humanæ fragilitatis, in alio divinæ potestas majestatis ostenditur.' And yet more pertinently Fulgentius; 'Restabat ad plenum nostræ redemptionis effectum, ut illuc usque homo sine peccato a Deo susceptus descenderet; quousque homo separatus a Deo, peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad Infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, et ad sepulchrum, ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi.' *Ad Thrasim. lib.* iii. *cap.* 30. [p. 135.] Εἰ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς εἵλετο, Κύριος ὢν τοῦ παντὸς καὶ Δεσπότης, καὶ φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, καὶ ζωὴ τῶν ἀπάντων, θανάτου γεύσασθαι, καὶ τὴν εἰς ᾅδου κατάβασιν ἐπιδέξασθαι, ὡς ἂν κατὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ὁμοιωθῇ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, &c. *Andreas Cret. Serm. de Vita Hum.* [p. 241 D.] I conclude this with that exposition of St. Hilary upon those words of the Psalmist, *If I go down into Hell, thou art there also;* 'Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut consepultis corporibus ad Inferos animæ descendant: quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit.' *Tract. in Psal.* 138. [p. 514 C.]

* [This treatise is not considered genuine. Vol. viii. append. p. 44 G.]

possession and exerciseth his dominion; that having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any
Heb. ii. 14. over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. *Through death* he *destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil;* and by his actual descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) in the writings of the Fathers[2]. Having thus examined the several interpretations of this part of the Article, we may now give a brief and safe account thereof, and teach every one how they may express their faith without any danger of mistake, saying, I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls 252
of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him; therefore as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes may every Christian say, I believe that Christ *descended into hell.*

He rose again.

WHATSOEVER variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or diminution[3]. The whole matter of it is so

2 As we read of the opinion in Tertullian's time, though not of him; 'Sed in hoc, inquiunt, Christus Inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus. Cæterum, quod discrimen Ethnicorum et Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem?' *De Anim. cap.* 55. [p. 304 A.] 'Aut ipsius vox est hic, *Eruisti animam meam ex Inferno inferiori;* aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo ille pervenit usque ad Infernum, ne nos remaneremus in Inferno.' *S. Augustin. in Psalm.* 85. [§. 17. vol. iv. p. 912 E.] Πάσχων γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέπαυσε, καὶ πεινῶν αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔτρεφε, καὶ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην καταβαίνων, ἡμᾶς ἀνέφερε. *S. Athanas. in* Omnia mihi trad. &c. [§. 2. vol. i. p. 104 F.]

3 For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the

necessary and essential to the Christian faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three particulars: First, the action itself, or the resurrection of Christ, *he rose again.* Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that resurrection, *he rose from the dead.* Thirdly, the circumstance of time, or distance of his resurrection from his death, he rose from the dead the *third day.*

For the illustration of the first particular, and the justification of our belief in Christ's resurrection, it will be necessary, first, to shew the promised Messias was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the Messias was to be the Son of David, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which David suffered both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the Messias in those words, *The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed,* that is, *his Christ.* From whence it came to pass, that *against the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done,* which was to crucify and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of David, and foretold of the Son of David, *Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.* As therefore the persecution in respect of David amounted only to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a settling in the kingdom; so being the conspiration against the Messias amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the

Ps. ii. 2.

Acts iv. 27, 28.

Ps. ii. 6, 7.

last word, *a mortuis*, and some copies in Ruffinus have it not; yet it is generally expressed in all the rest, which are more ancient than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the author or the scribe, than to the usage of the Church in their age. 'Quod die tertio resurrexit a mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambigit Christianus.' *S. August. Serm. in Vigiliis Paschæ.* [Serm. ccxxi. al. lxxix. vol. v. p. 964 E.]

dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his Anointed, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,* he did foretell and promise that he would raise the Messias from death to life.

But because this prediction was something obscured in the 253
figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it farther by the same Prophet, speaking by the mouth of David, but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the Son,

Psalm xvi. 9, 10. of David, *My flesh shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.*

Acts ii. 29, 30, 31. As for the *Patriarch David, he is both dead and buried,* and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but *being a Prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.* They were both to be separated by his death, and each to be disposed in that place which was respectively appointed for them; but neither long to continue there, the body not to be detained in the grave, the soul not to be left in hell, but both to meet, and being reunited to rise again.

Again, lest any might imagine that the Messias dying once might rise from death, and living after death, yet die again, there was a further prophecy to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the Messias was to be raised. For God giving this promise to his

Isa. lv. 3. people, *I will make an everlasting covenant with you,* (of which the Messias was to be the Mediator, and to ratify it by his death,) and adding this expression, *even the sure mercies of David,* could signify no less than that the Christ, who was given first unto us in a frail and mortal condition, in which he was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternal life. And thus by virtue of these three predictions we are assured that the Messias was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and presignify the same. Joseph, who was ordained to save his brethren from death who would have slain him, did represent the Son of God, who was slain by us, and yet dying saved us; and his being in the dungeon typified Christ's death; his being taken out from thence represented his resurrec-

tion[4]; as his evection to the power of Egypt next to Pharaoh, signified the session of Christ at the right hand of his Father. Isaac was sacrificed, and yet lived, to shew that Christ should truly die, and truly live again. And Abraham offered him up, *accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead,* Heb. xi. 19. *from whence also he received him in a figure.* In Abraham's intention Isaac died, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptation being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to presignify, that the only Son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and die, and after death was really and truly to be raised to life[5]. What was the intention of our father Abraham not performed, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfilled. And thus the resurrection of the Messias was represented by types, and foretold by prophecies; and therefore the Christ was to rise from the dead.

That Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us, and confirmed by testimonies human, angelical, and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, *held him by the feet, and worshipped him,* and as the first preach- Matt. ers of his resurrection, *with fear and great joy ran to bring his* xxviii. 8, 9. *Disciples word.* The blessed Apostles follow them, *to whom also* Acts i. 3.
254 *he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs:* who *with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord* Acts iv. 33. *Jesus;* the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, grounded upon this necessity: *Wherefore of these men* Acts i. 21, *which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went* 22. *in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.* The rest of the Disciples testified the same,

4 'Post duos annos dierum, tertio incipiente, de carcere educitur Joseph. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus die tertio a mortuis resurrexit. Præsentatur Pharaoni; mundo resurrectio declaratur—Data est Joseph a Pharaone in tota Ægypto potestas. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus post resurrectionem dicit, *Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra.*' *Prosper. de Promiss. et Prædict. p.* i. *cap.* 29. [p. 13 B.]

5 'Ideo Isaac immolatus non est, quia resurrectio Filio Dei servata est.' *Prosper. de Promiss. et Prædict. p.* i. *cap.* 17. [p. 10 C.] Οὕτως γὰρ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὸ μέγα μυστήριον τυπικῶς ἀμφοτέροις ἐπιμερίσαντος, τῷ τε ἠγαπημένῳ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ συμπαραδειχθέντι προβάτῳ, ὥστε δειχθῆναι ἐν μὲν τῷ προβάτῳ τὸ τοῦ θανάτου μυστήριον, ἐν δὲ τῷ μονογενεῖ τὴν ζωὴν, τὴν μὴ διακοπτομένην τῷ θανάτῳ. *S. Greg. Nyss. Orat.* i. *in Resur.* [vol. iii. p. 383 B.]

1 Cor. xv. 6. to whom he also appeared, even to *five hundred brethren at once.* These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as believed in him. And because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not only his Disciples, but even his enemies to confirm it. Those soldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the Matt. xxviii. 3, 4. *countenance* of an angel *like lightning, and his raiment white as snow;* they who upon that sight did *shake* and *became as dead men,* while he whom they kept became alive; even some of Verse 11. these *came into the city and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.* Thus was the resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest human testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony than that of man: and therefore an angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave Verse 2. a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, *and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.* Nay, John xx. 12. *two angels in white, sitting the one at the head, the other at the feet* Luke xxiv. 5, 6. *where the body of Jesus had lain,* said unto the women, *Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen.* These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the angelical testimony of the resurrection.

1 John v. 9. And *if we receive the witness of men,* or angels, *the witness of God is greater,* who did sufficiently attest this resurrection; not only because there was no other power but that of God which John xv. 26, 27. could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, *The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me;* adding these words to his Apostles, *and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.* The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were enlightened, comforted, confirmed, and strengthened in their Acts x. 40, 41. testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God *raised up* Jesus, *and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to* those *who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.* And thus, as it was foretold of the Messias, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our inquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christ's resurrection, expressed in that term, *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection; and secondly, to shew how those proprieties do belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper notion of the resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or angel, and make the same man or angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a
255 pure and total production. This change is called a substantial change, to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health; but neither of these is a resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible cannot be said to rise again; resurrection implying a reproduction; and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be; and therefore if they should be reproduced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but only a restitution of the *species* by another individual. But when a rational soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which lived before; and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For, first, by a true though miraculous

generation he was made flesh; and lived in his human nature a true and proper life, producing vital actions as we do. Secondly, he suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death; his soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, the same soul was reunited to the same body, and so he lived again the same man. For the truth of which, two things were necessary to be shewn upon his appearing after death; the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity, of his body. All the Apostles doubted of the first; for when Christ stood in the midst of them, *they were affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.* But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, *Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*[6]. He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself;* especially unbelieving Thomas, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.* The body then in which he rose, must be the same in which he lived before, because it was the same with which he died.

Luke xxiv. 37, 39.

John xx. 27.

And that we might be assured of the soul as well as of the body, first, he gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, *Have ye here any meat? and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb; and he took it and did eat before them.* Secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing with them, shewing himself, seeing and hearing them. Thirdly, he gave evidence of his rational and intellectual soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake *unto them while he was yet with them.* Thus did he shew, that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with an human soul. And that

Luke xxiv. 41–43.

Verse 44.

256

[6] Thus Ignatius disputes against the Δοκηταί in his days; Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα, καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι—Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν, ὡς σαρκικὸς, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ Πατρί. *Epist. ad Smyrn. cap.* 3. [p. 34.] 'Palpandam carnem [Dominus] præbuit, quam clausis januis introduxit—ut esse post resurrectionem ostenderet corpus suum et ejusdem naturæ, et alterius gloriæ.' *Greg. Magn. Homil.* 26. *in Evang.* [vol. i. p. 1553 D.] 'Resurrexit Christus, absoluta res est. Corpus erat, caro erat, pependit in cruce, emisit animam, posita est [caro] in sepulchro: exhibuit illam vivam, qui vivebat in illa.' *S. August. Serm.* cxlvii. *de Tempore, cap.* 1. [Serm. CCXLII. 1. vol. v. p. 1009 A.]

they might be yet further assured that it was the same soul by which that body lived before[7], he gave a full testimony of his Divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his Disciples. For being *no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven*, being the Divinity was never so united to any human soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that *he rose from the dead* by a true and proper resurrection. John iii. 13.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christ's resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be Christ himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly deserve to be raised unto life again[8]. Because *he drank of the brook in the way*, because *he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the cross*, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his resurrection. Now being Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body, with which he lived united, and died separated. Ps. cx. 7. Phil. ii. 8.

The efficient cause of the resurrection of Christ is to be considered either as principal or instrumental. The principal cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omni-

7 'Ideo clausis ad discipulos ostiis introibat, et flatu suo dabat Spiritum sanctum, et dato intelligentiæ lumine, sanctarum scripturarum occulta pandebat; et rursus idem vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, et omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat: ut agnosceretur in eo proprietas divinæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere.' *Leo, Serm.* i. *de Resur.* [c. iii. vol. i. p. 305.]

8 'Ut mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus resurrectione clarificaretur vel glorificaretur, prius humiliatus est passione: non enim a mortuis resurrexisset, si mortuus non fuisset. Humilitas claritatis est meritum, claritas humilitatis est præmium.' *S. August. Tract.* 104 *in Joan.* [§. 3. vol. iii. part ii. p. 760 A.]

potent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite agent.

Acts ii. 32. *This Jesus hath God raised up*, saith the Apostle, *whereof we all are witnesses*. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so Christ's resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did Christ himself, who was no otherwise raised than by an eminent act of God's omnipotency; which is excellently set forth by the Apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions, as I think is scarce to be paralleled in any

Eph. i. 19. 20. author; *that we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead*[9]. Being then omnipotency is a Divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; being no less power than infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, that whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal agent.

And therefore in the Scriptures the raising of Christ is attri- 257
buted to God the Father (according to those words of the Apo-

Gal. i. 1. stle, *Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead*), but is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which Christ was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter shew the same true also of the Holy Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised Christ from the dead[10]. Nor is

9 Eph. i. 19. Καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ—κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. Which words our translation comes far short of, and I doubt our language can scarce reach it. For first, here are δύναμις and ἰσχύς, two words to express the power of God, and the validity and force of it, but not sufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως, and κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος, two words more to express the eminent greatness of this power and force, but not sufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each addition; τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος, and ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτους, to set forth the eminence and activity of that greatness; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till it be quickened with an active verb, ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐν νεκρῶν. All which he *set on work*, all which he *actuated* in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.

10 'Quis nisi solus Filius resurrexit? Quia solus mori potuit, qui carnem habuit: et tamen ab hoc opere, quo solus

this only true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the Socinians, who maintain, that God the Father only raised Christ, and then say they teach as much as the Apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it only so, yet if he which taught the Apostles taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised Christ, because St. Paul hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that Christ did raise himself, but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the Jews, *Destroy this temple,* John ii. 19, *and in three days I will raise it up;* and this is the explication [21]. of the Apostle, *But he spake of the temple of his body,* which he might very properly call a temple, because *the fulness of the God-* Col. ii. 9. *head dwelt in him bodily.* And *when he was risen from the dead,* John ii. 22. *his Disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture, and the word that Jesus had said.* Now if upon the resurrection of Christ the Apostles believed those words of Christ, *Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up,* then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised Christ, and no other person mentioned but himself.

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this argument, saying, that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise ourselves out of the graves when the trump should sound[11]: and this was all which Christ did or could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up.*

Filius resurrexit, non erat Pater alienus, de quo scriptum est, *Qui suscitavit a mortuis Jesum.* An forte se ipse non suscitavit? Et ubi est quod ait, *Solvite templum hoc, et triduo suscitabo illud?* et quod *potestatem se habere* dicit *ponendi et iterum sumendi animam suam?* Quis autem ita desipiat, ut putet Spiritum sanctum resurrectionem hominis Christi non cooperatum, cum ipsum hominem Christum fuerit operatus? *S. Aug. cont. Serm. Arian. c.* 15. [vol. viii. p. 635 E.]

11 'Aliter Deus Christum suscitavit, aliter Christus corpus suum: Deus Christo vitam restituendo, Christus vita recuperata corpus suum levando, et e sepulchro prodeundo, seque post mortem vivum sistendo præbendoque. Sic et paralyticus ille erexerat corpus suum, accepta a Christo sanitate: sic et omnes mortui surgent, et ex monumentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Christo vita.' *Confessionis Socinianæ Vindices.*

For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shewn it alive.

This answer therefore is a mere shift: for to raise a body which is dead, is, in the language of the Scriptures, to give life
John v. 21. unto it, or to quicken a mortal body. *For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will*[12]. He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he 258

12 Ἐγείρειν τοὺς νεκρούς and ζωοποιεῖν is the same thing; and therefore one in the Apodosis answereth to both in the Protasis, and sheweth that Christ raiseth and quickeneth whom he will, which demonstrateth his infinite and absolute power. Καί τοι τὸ, οὐδὲν δύναται ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖν, τῷ, οὓς θέλει, ἐναντίον ἐστίν. Εἰ γὰρ οὓς θέλει, δύναται ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν ἐξουσίας· εἰ δὲ οὐ δύναται ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὐκέτι οὓς θέλει. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ, ὥσπερ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει, τῆς δυνάμεως δείκνυσι τὴν ἀπαραλλαξίαν· τὸ δὲ, οὓς θέλει, τῆς ἐξουσίας τὴν ἰσότητα. *S. Chrysost. Homil.* 38. *in Joan.* [al. Hom. 37. §. 4. vol. viii. p. 223 C.] Where it is very observable that though ἐγείρειν τοὺς νεκρούς and ζωοποιεῖν be the same in the language of the Scriptures, yet ἐγείρειν and ζωογονεῖν are not the same. By which observation the late learned bishop of Ely hath most evidently detected that Socinian cavil. 'Si quis obstinate vocem *excitabo* [ἐγερῶ] urgere vult, is animadvertat quid D. Jesus alibi dicat, *Eum qui perdiderit animam, vivificaturum eam.* Ubi si quis insistere vellet ipsis verbis, eum colligere oporteret, credentes etiam ipsos sese vivificaturos, et a mortuis excitaturos.' *Catech. Racov.* p. 278. [p. 218.] For ἐγερῶ hath manifest relation to the dead, but ζωογονῶ unto the living. And therefore our translation hath very well rendered those words, Luke xvii. 33. Ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ αὐτὴν, ζωογονήσει αὐτήν· *Whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it:* so that ζωογονεῖν ψυχήν is *to preserve life*, which interpretation is most evident out of the antithesis of the same place; Ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. For σῶσαι and ἀπολέσει in the former part are the same with ἀπολέσῃ and ζωογονήσει in the latter. And beside, this is the language of St. Luke, who, Acts vii. 19, says that the Egyptians ill intreated the Israelites, τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι, *So that they cast out their young children, to the end they might not live,* that is, *remain alive; Syr.* רלא נחון, *ne servarentur, ne viverent,* as the Arabic. In which words there is a manifest reference to that place in Exodus, where thrice this word is used in that sense by the LXX, as i. 17. והחיין את־הילדים, Καὶ ἐζωογόνουν τὰ ἄρσενα· *Vulg. Tr. Sed conservabant mares; Chald.* וקימא ית־בניא; so verse 18. ἐζωογονεῖτε τὰ ἄρσενα· and 22. καὶ πᾶν θῆλυ, ζωογονεῖτε αὐτό. And indeed חיה in Piel is often used for *keeping* or *preserving alive*, and is so several times translated ζωογονῶ as well as ζωγρῶ; as Jud. viii. 19. לו החיתם, Εἰ ἐζωογονήκειτε αὐτοὺς, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέκτεινα ὑμᾶς· *Vulg. Tr. Si servassetis eos, non vos occiderem: If ye had saved them alive, I would not slay you.* 1 Sam. xxvii. 9. ולא יחיה, Καὶ οὐκ ἐζωογόνει ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα. *Vulg. Tr. Nec relinquebat viventem virum et mulierem; And left neither man nor woman alive:* and which is yet nearer to our purpose, 1 Kings xx. 31. אולי יחיה את־נפשך LXX. Εἴπως ζωογονήσει τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν· *Vulg. Tr. Forsitan salvabit animas nostras; Peradventure he will save thy life.* So that ζωογονεῖν in the language of the LXX. is *to save alive*, and ζωογονεῖν τὴν ψυχήν, is *to preserve one's life.* So that St. Luke, in the text cited by the Socinians, could intend no more than that he which was ready to lose his life for Christ should thereby preserve it, and consequently he speaks nothing of the raising of the dead.

raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the suscitation must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christ's body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved than by that separation. God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of each to other, suffered no dissolution. Thus as the Apostle *desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ,* so the temple Phil. i. 23.
of Christ's body was dissolved here, by the separation of his soul: for the temple standing was the body living; and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickening of the body. If the body of Christ had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre when it was before quickened, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would do, and the Apostles believed he did.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power only to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himself to reunite his soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of himself, *I lay down* John x. 17,
my life (or *soul*) *that I might take it again. No man taketh it* 18.
from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. The laying down of Christ's life was to die, and the taking of it again was to revive; and by this taking of his life again he shewed himself to be *the* John xi. 25.
resurrection and the life. For he *which was made of the seed of* Rom. i. 3, 4.
David according to the flesh, was *declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.* But if Christ had done no more in the resurrection, than lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth therefore that Christ, by that power which he had within himself, did take his life again which he had laid down, did reunite his soul unto his body, from which he separated it when he gave up the ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself: and so it is a certain truth, not only that God the Father raised the Son, but also that God the Son raised himself[13].

[13] Καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. cap.* 2. [p. 34.] 'Si peccati confessor revixit a morte, quis eum suscitavit? Nullus mortuus est sui ipsius suscitator. Ille se potuit suscitare, qui

From this consideration of the efficient cause of Christ's resurrection, we are yet farther assured, that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead in the same soul and the same 259
body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversy that he raised his own Son: and as while he was here
Matt. iii. 17. alive, God spake from heaven, saying, *This is my well-beloved Son;* so after his death it was the same person, of whom he
Psalm ii. 7. spake by the Prophet, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* If we look upon Christ himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly rise in soul and body by that Divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the soul. And thus we have sufficiently proved our second particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of Christ's resurrection, contained in those words, *he rose from the dead.*

The third particular concerns the time of Christ's resurrection, which is expressed by *the third day:* and those words afford a double consideration; one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three days; the other in respect of the day, which was the third day from his passion, and the precise day upon which he rose. For the first of these, we shall shew that the Messias, who was foretold both to die and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that in correspondence to these predictions, our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not rise from the dead until, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations; one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day itself. The first is that of the Pro-
Jonah i. 17. ii. 10. phet Jonas, who *was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights,* and then by the special command of God he was rendered safe upon the dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to the great city of Nineveh. This was an express type of the Messias then to come, who was to preach repentance and
Matt. xii. 40. remission of sins to all nations; that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be*

mortua carne non mortuus est. Etenim hoc suscitavit quod mortuum fuerat. Ille se suscitavit qui vivebat in se, in carne autem sua suscitanda mortuus erat. Non enim Pater solus Filium suscitavit, de quo dictum est ab Apostolo, *Propter quod et Deus eum exaltavit:* sed etiam Dominus seipsum, id est, corpus suum; unde dicit, *Solvite templum hoc, et in triduo suscitabo illud.*' *S. August. de Verb. Dom. Serm.* viii. *cap.* 1. [Serm. LXVII. 2. vol. v. p. 374 D.]

three days and three nights in the heart of the earth: and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the Messias, after three days, be taken out of the jaws of death, and restored unto the land of the living.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by Moses: *When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord.* For under the Levitical Law, all the fruits of the earth in the land of Canaan were profane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated; and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them; so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptation of that: *for if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy.* And this was always done the day after the sabbath, that is, the paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed: by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the priest to God, so the promised Messias, that immaculate Lamb which was to die, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the resurrection of the Messias after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

Lev. xxiii. 10, 11, 12.

Rom. xi. 16.

And now, in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true Messias, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise *the third day;* and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that sabbath mentioned in the Law.

As for the distance between the resurrection and the death

of Christ, it is to be considered, first, generally in itself, as it is some space of time: secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. Christ did not, would not, suddenly arise, lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live; and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did some time continue it. He might have descended from the cross before he died; but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us[14]. He might have revived himself upon the cross after he had given up the ghost, and before Joseph came to take him down; but he would not, lest as Pilate questioned whether he were already dead, so we might doubt whether he ever died[15]. The reward of his resurrection was immediately due upon his passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them.

Again, Because Christ's exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his resurrection; because the Apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave; therefore the space between his resurrection and passion could not be long; nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Lest therefore his Disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether

14 'De cruce descendere poterat, sed differebat ut de sepulchro resurgeret.' *S. August. Tract.* 12 *in Joan.* [§. 6. vol. iii. part ii. p. 386 D.]

15 Ἠδύνατο μὲν καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τοῦ θανάτου τὸ σῶμα διεγεῖραι καὶ πάλιν δεῖξαι ζῶν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο καλῶς προϊδὼν ὁ Σωτὴρ οὐ πεποίηκεν· εἶπε γὰρ ἄν τις μηδ' ὅλως αὐτὸ τεθνηκέναι, ἢ μηδὲ τέλεον αὐτοῦ τὸν θάνατον ἐψαυκέναι, εἰ παρ' αὐτὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἦν ἐπιδείξας. Τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐν ἴσῳ τοῦ διαστήματος ὄντος τοῦ τε θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ἄδηλον ἐγίνετο τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας κλέος. Ὅθεν ἵνα δειχθῇ νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μίαν ὑπέμεινε μέσην ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τριταῖον τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἔδειξεν ἄφθαρτον. *S. Athanas. de Incarn. Verbi.* [c. 26. vol. i. p. 69 D.] Καὶ τρεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας διὰ τοῦτο συνεχώρησεν, ἵνα πιστευθῇ ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, οὐ γὰρ τῷ σταυρῷ αὐτῷ μόνον βεβαιοῦται, καὶ τῇ πάντων ὄψει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν. *S. Chrysost. Homil.* 43. *in Matt.* [al. Hom. 44. §. 2. vol. vii. p. 459 D.]

he rose with the same body with which he died, or no; that he might shew himself alive while the soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay many days before he rose[16]. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his resurrection.

The particular length of this space is determined in *the third day*: but that expression being capable of some diversity of
261 interpretation, it is not so easily concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in St. Matthew, that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* From whence it seemeth to follow, that Christ's body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is on Thursday; otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

Matt. xii. 40.

But this place, as express as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered: as when our Saviour said, *After three days I will rise again;* and again, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up,* or, *within three days I will build another made without hands.* But that which is most used, both in our Saviour's prediction before his death, and in the Apostle's language after the resurrection, is, that he *rose from the dead the third day*[17]. Now according

Matt. xxvii. 63. Mark viii. 31. John ii. 19. Mark xiv. 58.

Matt. xvi. 21.

16 Ἕνεκα μὲν οὖν τοῦ δειχθῆναι τὸν θάνατον ἐν τῷ σώματι, τριταῖον ἀνέστησε τοῦτο· ἵνα δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαμεῖναν καὶ φθαρὲν τέλευν ὕστερον ἀναστήσας ἀπιστηθῇ, ὡς οὐκ αὐτὸ, ἀλλ' ἕτερον σῶμα φέρων· (ἔμελλε γὰρ ἄν τις καὶ δι' αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀπιστεῖν τῷ φαινομένῳ, καὶ ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τῶν γενομένων·) διὰ τοῦτο οὐ πλείω τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἠνέσχετο, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ τοὺς ἀκούσαντας αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως παρείλκυσεν· ἀλλ' ἔτι τῶν ἀκοῶν αὐτῶν ἔναυλον ἐχόντων τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἔτι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν ἐκδεχομένων, καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν ἠρτημένης, καὶ ζώντων ἐπὶ γῆς ἔτι, καὶ ἐπὶ τόπον ὄντων τῶν θανατωσάντων, καὶ μαρτυρούντων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος, αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἐν τριταίῳ διαστήματι τὸ γενόμενον νεκρὸν σῶμα ἔδειξεν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἄφθαρτον. *S. Athanasius de Incarnatione Verbi.* [§. 26. vol. i. p. 69 E.]

17 These several phrases are used; first that Christ was in the heart of the earth τρεῖς ἡμέρας, καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας· secondly, that he was to rise μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας· thirdly, that he would rebuild this temple ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, and διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν· and lastly, that he rose τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, which is the most general and constant form of speech.

Matt. xvii. 23. xx. 19. Mark ix. 31. x. 34. Luke ix. 22. xviii. 33. xxiv. 7, 46. Acts x. 40. 1 Cor. xv. 4.

to the language of the Scriptures, if Christ were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he rose is another, and consequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and of his resurrection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is. Whitsunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easter-day the day of the resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days. Christ then, who rose upon the first day of the week, (as is confessed by all,) died upon the sixth day of the week before: or if he had died upon the fifth, he had risen not upon the third, but the fourth day, as Lazarus did[18]. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on *the third day*[19]; being according to the constant

[18] Lazarus is said to be τεταρταῖος, four days dead, that is counting the day on which he died, and the day on which his sister spake so to our Saviour at his sepulchre: and being he was raised then, he rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, *the fourth day*. Our Saviour rose τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, and therefore he was τριταῖος when he arose; and so the Fathers call him, as you may observe in the words last cited out of St. Athanasius.

[19] As we read in Plutarch, Σολεὺς ὁ Θεσπέσιος—ἐξέθανε, καὶ τριταῖος ἤδη περὶ τὰς ταφὰς αὐτὰς ἀνήνεγκε· *De his qui sero pun.* [vol. ii. p. 563 D.] and of that spirit in a boy possessed, who hated all women, Ἐπεὶ ἡ γυνὴ περὶ τὴν εὐνὴν ὕβρισε, τριταίου κειμένου γαμηθεῖσα ἑτέρῳ. *Philostrat. de Vit. Apoll. Tyan. lib.* iii. *cap.* 12. [c. 38.] What this τριταῖος is, the Greek grammarians will teach us: Πρὸς μὲν τὸ πόσα ἀπαντᾷ τὸ τρία τυχὸν ἢ τέσσαρα, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πόστον τὸ τρίτον ἢ τέταρτον ἐπὶ τάξεως, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ποσταῖον τὸ τριταῖον ἢ τεταρταῖον· οἷον πρὸς τὸ, ποσταῖον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ πάρει; ἀπαντήσει τὸ, τριταῖος τυχὸν ἢ τεταρταῖος, ἤγουν τρίτην ἡμέραν ἔχω ἀφ' οὗ πάρειμι ἢ τετάρτην. *Schol. Eurip. Hec. v.* 32. Τριταῖος then, in respect of his coming to or from any place, is that person which is now the third day in or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the Greek language, than in the expression of a Tertian fever, called so because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. In which case there is but one day between, in which the patient is wholly free from his disease: from whence παρὰ μίαν and τριταϊκῶς is the same in the language of the physicians. This is excellently expressed by Alexander Aphrodisæus in that problematical question, Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν τριταῖος ἐκ θερμοῦ χυμοῦ γιγνόμενος, καὶ ἔχων μαστίζουσαν καὶ κατελαύνουσαν χολὴν, παρὰ μίαν κινεῖται· ὁ δὲ ἀμφημερινὸς, ἔχων πεδῆσαν τὸ φλέγμα τῇ βαρύτητι καὶ ψυχρότητι καθ' ἡμέραν· ὁ δὲ τεταρταῖος διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων. *Probl.* 10. lib. ii. The Quotidian ague hath its accessions καθ' ἡμέραν· the Tertian παρὰ μίαν (*sub.* ἡμέραν) after one day of perfect inter-

language of the Greeks and Hebrews, he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day, who died upon any other day between which and the day of his resurrection there intervened any more than one day: therefore those other forms of speech which are far less frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of *the third day* so often reiterated.

262 When therefore we read that *after three days* he would raise the temple of his body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole days dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as Joseph and his mother *after three days found him in the temple*, that is, Luke ii. 46. the third day after he tarried behind in Jerusalem. And when we read, that he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, we must not look upon those nights as distinct from the days[20], but as Moses spake, *the evening and the morning*,

mission; the Quartan διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων. In the same manner he mentions the πεμπταῖον, the ἑβδομαῖον, and ἐνναταῖον: in all which this is constantly observable, that the days of perfect intermission are fewer by two, than the number in the name of the fever: for if the fever be a τριταῖος, the day of intermission is but one, if τεταρταῖος two, if πεμπταῖος three, if ἑβδομαῖος five, if ἐνναταῖος seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and died the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise τριταῖος; if he were two whole days in the grave, he rose τεταρταῖος. So Aristotle; Διὰ τί ὁ νυκτερινὸς βορέας τριταῖος λήγει; πότερον ὅτι ἀπὸ μικρᾶς καὶ ἀσθενοῦς ἀρχῆς; ἡ τρίτη δὲ κρίσιμος. *Probl.* 14. *sect.* xxvi. Τῇ τρίτῃ therefore and τριταῖος is the same. For from τρίτη comes τριταῖος, and from τετάρτη, τεταρταῖος, in which ἡμέρᾳ is always understood. Τεταρταῖος, τετραήμερος. *Suid.* Τριταῖος then is τριήμερος· πυρετὸς τριταῖος, διὰ τρίτης· and τεταρταῖος, διὰ τετάρτης. Thus being Christ did certainly rise τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, he did rise according to the Greeks τριταῖος· and according to the same then he must also rise παρὰ μίαν, that is, one day only interceding between the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.

20 A night and a day in the Hebrew language, not used to compositions, is the same with the Greek νυχθήμερον or ἡμερονύκτιον ויהי־ערב ויהי־בקר יום אחד: *The evening and the morning were the first day.* For though *God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night,* yet at the same time that day and that night was called *day.* So that the same word יום in the same verse signifieth both the natural and artificial day. And the evening and the morning are sometimes put instead of the day; as Dan. viii. 14. עד ערב בקר אלפים ושלש מאות *Unto two thousand and three hundred days,* and verse 26. מראה הערב והבקר, which we translate, *The vision of the evening and the morning,* but might be rather translated in reference to the former, *The vision of the days,* viz. the 2300 days before spoken of. Now though a day be thus diversely taken, yet in the measuring of any time which containeth in it both days and nights, a day is always taken in that sense in which it comprehendeth both day and night. Thus Galen, who is very punctual and exact in all his language, and full of expositions of the words he uses, to prevent mistakes, being to speak of the critical days, gives notice that by a day he understands not that space of time which is opposed to the night, but that which comprehendeth both the night and day: Ἡμέραν δηλονότι παρ' ὅλον τὸν λόγον εἰρησομένοις, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῆς μόνης συνεστῶσαν, ἀλλὰ κἀκ τῆς νυκτὸς χρόνου· καθάπερ οὖν καὶ τὸν μῆνα

that is, the night and the day, *were the first day;* and as the
Dan. viii. 14. saint spake unto Daniel, *Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings,* intending thereby so many days: nor must we imagine that those three days were completed after our Saviour's death, and before he rose: but that upon the first of those three days he died, and upon the last of those three days
Luke ii. 21. he rose. As we find that *eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child;* and yet Christ was born upon the first, and circumcised upon the last of those eight days[21]: nor were there any more than six whole days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the five and twentieth of December, the other upon the first of January. And as the Jews were wont to speak, the priests in their courses by the appointment of David were to minister before the Lord eight days, whereas every week a new course succeeded, and there were but seven days' service for each course (the sabbath on which they began, and the sabbath on which they went off, being both reckoned in the eight days); so the day on which the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again, were included in the number of three days. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead

τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν εἶναι λέγομεν, οὐ μόνον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, ὃν ὑπὲρ τῆς γῆς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνεται, προσαγορεύοντες ἡμέραν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν τῆς νυκτὸς αὐτῷ προστιθέντες· οὕτως δέ πως καὶ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν πέντε καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἡμερῶν εἶναί φαμεν. *De Crisibus, lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. This is observed by St. Basil to be also the custom of the Scriptures, upon those words in Genesis, Ἐγένετο οὖν ἑσπέρα, καὶ ἐγένετο πρωΐ· τὸ ἡμερονύκτιον λέγει· καὶ οὐκέτι προσηγόρευσεν, ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐπικρατοῦντι τὴν πᾶσαν προσηγορίαν ἀπένειμε. Ταύτην ἂν καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γραφῇ τὴν συνήθειαν εὕροις, ἐν τῇ τοῦ χρόνου μετρήσει ἡμέρας ἀριθμουμένας, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ νυκτὰς μετὰ τῶν ἡμερῶν. *In Hexaem. Homil.* 2. [§. 8. vol. i. p. 20 C.] Now being generally in all computations of time, as St. Basil observeth, ἐν τῇ τοῦ χρόνου μετρήσει, a day was taken for the whole space of day and night; and as the evening and the morning signifieth the same, that is, a day; and 2300 evenings and mornings no more than so many days; and so three days and three nights in the computation of time signify no more than three days; (*For God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night, and the evening and the morning were the first day, and the evening and the morning were the second day,* &c.) being three days in the language of the Scripture are said to be fulfilled when the third day is come, though it be not wholly passed over; it followeth that to be three days dead, or to be three days and three nights dead, in the Hebrew language, cannot necessarily infer any more, than that the person spoken of did continue dead till the third day.

21 As we read of the circumcision of our Saviour, Ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτώ· St. Luke ii. 21. so of Zachary, Ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ· St. Luke i. 23. and though the number ὀκτώ were not expressed, yet it is to be understood, according to the language of the Scripture in other cases, and of Josephus particularly in this; Διέταξε δὲ μίαν πατριὰν διακονεῖσθαι τῷ Θεῷ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ, ἀπὸ σαββάτου ἐπὶ σάββατον. *Jud. Antiq. lib.* vii. *cap.* 11. [c. 14. §. 7.]

upon the third day properly, and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth synecdochically[22].

263 This is sufficient for the clearing the precise distance of Christ's resurrection from his crucifixion, expressed in the determinate number of three days: the next consideration is, what day of the week that *third day* was, on which Christ did actually rise, and what belongeth to that day in relation to his resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day; the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the *third*, after the manner already delivered and confirmed; the second is the Evangelist's expression of the time on which Christ rose.

The character of the day in which our Saviour died is undeniable, for it is often expressly called the *preparation*[23]; as we

22 So St. Jerom on Jonas ii. 1. [vol. vi. p. 405 C.] '*Et erat Jonas in ventre piscis tribus diebus et tribus noctibus.* Hujus loci mysterium in Evangelio Dominus exponit: et superfluum est vel idipsum, vel aliud dicere quam exposuit ipse qui passus est. Hoc solum quærimus, quomodo tres dies et tres noctes fuerit in corde terræ. Quidam παρασκευήν, quando sole fugiente ab hora sexta usque ad horam nonam, nox successit diei, in duos dies et noctes dividunt, et apponentes sabbatum, tres dies et tres noctes æstimant supputandas: nos vero συνεκδοχικῶς totum intelligamus a parte: ut ex eo quod ἐν παρασκευῇ mortuus est, unam diem supputemus et noctem, et sabbati alteram: tertiam vero noctem, quæ diei Dominicæ mancipatur, referamus ad exordium diei alterius; nam et in Genesi nox non præcedentis diei est, sed sequentis, id est, principium futuri, non finis præteriti.' To the same purpose St. Augustin; 'Ipsum autem triduum non totum et plenum fuisse, Scriptura testis est; sed primus dies a parte extrema totus annumeratus est; dies vero tertius a parte prima, et ipse totus; medius autem inter eos, i. e. secundus dies absolute totus viginti quatuor horis suis, duodecim nocturnis, et duodecim diurnis. Crucifixus est enim primo Judæorum vocibus hora tertia, cum esset dies sexta sabbati. Deinde, in ipsa cruce suspensus est hora sexta, et spiritum tradidit hora nona. Sepultus est autem cum jam sero factum esset, sicut sese habent verba Evangelii, quod intelligitur in fine diei. Unde libet ergo incipias, etiamsi alia ratio reddi potest, quomodo non sit contra Evangelium Joannis, ut hora tertia ligno suspensus intelligatur: totum diem primum non comprehendis. Ergo a parte extrema totus computabitur, sicut tertius a parte prima. Nox enim usque ad diluculum, quo Domini resurrectio declarata est, ad tertium diem pertinet.' *De Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 6. [§. 10. vol. viii. p. 816 F.] And after him Leo the Great; 'Ne turbatos discipulorum animos longa mœstitudo cruciaret, denunciatam tridui moram tam mira celeritate breviavit, ut dum ad integrum secundum diem pars primi novissima, et pars tertii prima concurrit, et aliquantum temporis spatio decideret, et nihil dierum numero deperiret.' *Serm.* 1. *De Resur. Dom. Isidor. Pelus. lib.* i. *Epist.* 114. [p. 35.]

23 Παρασκευή. '*Parasceue* interpretatur præparatio,' saith St. Augustin, *De Cons. Evang. lib.* iii. *cap.* 13. and in the Greek language it signifieth generally any preparation of what nature soever: but in this case it signifieth rather the time in which preparation was made, as St. Luke xxiii. 54. Καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευή· and that preparation among the Jews for the sabbath; as St. Mark xv. 42. Ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευὴ, ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον·

John xix. 42. read, they therefore laid Jesus in the garden, *because of the Jews' preparation* day, *for the sepulchre was nigh at hand;* and Matt. xxvii. 62. *the next day that followed the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees* asked a guard. Now this day of preparation was the day immediately before the sabbath or some other great feast of the Jews, called by them the eve of the sabbath or the feast; and therefore called the preparation, because on that day they did prepare whatsoever was necessary for the celebration of the following festival, according to that command in the case of

and in the edict of Augustus Cæsar, Εγγύας τε μὴ ὁμολογεῖν ἐν σάββασιν, ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐννάτης. *Joseph. Jud. Antig. lib.* xvi. *cap.* 10. [c. vi. §. 2.] which is well expressed by Synesius; 'Ημέρα μὲν οὖν ἦν, ἣν τινα ἄγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρασκευήν· τὴν δὲ νύκτα τῇ μετ' αὐτὴν ἡμέρᾳ λογίζονται, καθ' ἣν οὐδενὶ θέμις ἐστὶν ἐνεργὸν ἔχειν τὴν χεῖρα, ἀλλὰ τιμῶντες διαφερόντως αὐτὴν, ἄγουσιν ἀπραξίαν. *Epist.* 4. [p. 163 D.] This παρασκευή of the Hebrews was answerable to the *cœna pura* of the Gentiles, as the old Glossary; *Cœna pura, προσάββατον, et in Gloss. Latino-Arabico,* 'Paraseeue, cœna pura, id est, præparatio quæ fit pro sabbato.' From whence some of the Fathers did so interpret the eves of the Jewish sabbaths; as Tertullian; 'Dies observatis, et menses, et tempora, et annos, et sabbata, ut opinor, et cœnas puras, et jejunia, et dies magnos.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* v. *cap.* 4. [p. 465 A.] 'Acceleratam vult intelligi sepulturam, ne advesperasceret: quando jam propter parasceuen, quam cœnam puram Judæi Latine usitatius apud nos vocant, facere tale aliquid non licebat.' *S. August. Tract.* 120. *in Joan.* [§. 5. vol. iii. part ii. p. 805 C.] And the ancient translators of the Greek Fathers did use the Latin *cœna pura* for the Greek παρασκευή. As the Interpreter of St. Chrysostom; 'Qua enim die conceptus est Dominus eadem die et passus est; eadem ipsa die cœna pura fuit, in qua et luna quarta-decima occurrit.' *Serm. in Natalem Joan. Bapt.* So likewise the old Interpreter of Irenæus; 'Parasceue, quæ dicitur cœna pura, id est, sexta feria, quam et Dominus ostendit passus in ea.' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* v. *cap.* 19. [c. 23. §. 2. p. 331.]—'Mosen in sexta die dixisse,—quæ est in cœna pura, &c.' *Ibid. lib.* i. *cap.* 10. [c. 14. §. 6. p. 71.] As therefore the *cœna pura* among the Gentiles was that time in which they prepared and sanctified themselves for their sacred solemnities, so the Jews did make use of that word to signify their sanctification, and of the Greek παρασκευή to testify the preparation of all things used on their holy days, upon the eve thereof, or day before. 'Parasceue Latine præparatio est: sed isto verbo Græco libentius utuntur Judæi in hujusmodi observationibus, etiam qui magis Latine quam Græce loquuntur,' saith St. Augustin: *Tract.* 117. *in Joan.* [§. 2. p. 797 A.] So that the same Father testified that the Jews speaking Latin in his time, did sometime use *parasceue,* sometime *cœna pura,* for their eve of preparation. Otherwise in their own language they called it ערובתא; by which generally they understood the sixth day of the week, the day before the sabbath. For so they reckoned the days of the week in *Bereshit Rabba;* חד בשבתא, *the first of the week;* תרי, *the second;* תלתא, *the third;* ארבעתא, *the fourth;* חמשתא, *the fifth;* ערובתא, *the eve;* שבתא, *the sabbath.* Thus in Hebrew ערובתא, in Greek παρασκευή, in Latin *cœna pura,* were used by the Jews for the same day, the Friday or sixth of the week; but not for that alone, but for the eve of any great festival which answered to a sabbath; so that they had their ערב השבת, and ערב היום טוב, as παρασκευὴ τοῦ σαββάτου, and παρασκευὴ τοῦ Πάσχα. And when a great festival fell upon the sabbath, then, as the festivities were both one day, so the eve to both was the same Friday. And such was the day of preparation on which our Saviour was crucified.

manna, *It shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.* This preparation being used both before the sabbath and other festivals, at this time it had both relations: for first, it was the preparation to a sabbath, as appeareth by those words of St. Mark, *Now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath;* and those of St. Luke, *That day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on.* Secondly, It was also the eve of a festival, even of the great day of the paschal solemnity, as appeareth by St. John, who saith, when Pilate sat down to the judgment-seat, *it was the preparation of the passover.* And that the great paschal festivity did then fall upon the sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or eve of both, appeareth yet farther by the same Evangelist, saying, *The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, for that sabbath-day was an high day;* that is, not only an ordinary or weekly sabbath, but also a great festival, even a paschal sabbath. Now being the sabbath of the Jews was constant, and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it followeth that the preparation or eve thereof must necessarily be the sixth day of the week; which from the day, and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the passion upon that day, we call *Good Friday.* And from that day being the sixth of one, the third must consequently be the eighth, or the first of the next week[24].

Exod. xvi. 5.

264

Mark xv. 42.

Luke xxiii. 54.

John xix. 14.

Ver. 31.

24 Ὁρᾶτε, πῶς λέγει, οὐ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτὰ, ἀλλὰ ἃ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα, ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν· διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς. *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 15. [p. 47.] Ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀνάπαυσις ἐν κυριακῇ ἐν ὀγδοάδει ἡ κυριακὴ ὀνομάζεται. *Theodorus, Epist.* 1. Ἡ δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς, κελεύουσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παντὸς περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πονηρίας διὰ τοῦ ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Μία γὰρ τῶν σαββάτων, πρώτη μένουσα τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάλιν τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κυκλοφορίας ὀγδόη καλεῖται, καὶ πρώτη οὖσα μένει. *Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 41. [p. 138 A.] 'Cum in septimo die sabbati sit et nomen et observantia constituta; tamen nos in octava die, quæ et ipsa prima est, perfecti sabbati festivitate lætamur.' *S. Hilar. Com. in Psal. Prol.* [p. 8 A.] 'Hæc octava sententia, quæ ad caput redit, perfectumque hominem declarat, significatur fortasse et circumcisione octavo die in veteri Testamento, et Domini resurrectione post sabbatum, qui est utique octavus, idemque primus dies.' *S. August. de Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [§. 12. vol. iii. part ii. p. 170 B.] Καὶ τὸ ἔθος καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτεῖ πᾶσαν Κυριακὴν τιμᾶν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ πανηγυρίζειν, ἐπειδήπερ ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ἡμῖν ἐπρυτάνευσε·

The next character of this third day is the expression of the time of the resurrection in the Evangelists. *When the sabbath was past,* saith St. Mark, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, *very early in the morning, the first day of the week: In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week,* saith St. Matthew: *Upon the first day of the week early in the morning,* saith St. Luke: *The first day of the week early when it was yet dark,* saith St. John. By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the preparation, which was the eve of the sabbath, and continuing there the whole sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and farther resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning was revived by the accession and union of his soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

Mark xvi. 1, 2.

Matt. xxviii. 1. Luke xxiv. 1. John xx. 1.

Whereby it came to pass, that the obligation of the day, which was then the sabbath, died and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater redemption was confirmed. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the Law we find this particular cause assigned, *Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded* 265 *thee to keep the sabbath-day.* Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation than any other number: secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment itself. There was therefore a double reason

Deut. v. 15.

διὸ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς καὶ πρώτη κέκληται, ὡς ἀρχὴ ζωῆς ἡμῶν ὑπάρχουσα, καὶ ὀγδόη, ἅτε ὑπερβεβηκυῖα τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων σαββατισμόν. *Theophil. Alex. Edict.* [Galland. vii. p. 603 A.]

rendered by God why the Jews should keep that sabbath which they did; one special, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought than that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it than to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventhly return upon the reference to the creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God; *This month*, the month of Abib, shall be *unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you*; so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the hebdomadal or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead; and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day: *for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth —all things were created by him and for him.*

Exod. xii. 2.

Col. i. 16.

This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes, and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: for *the same day*, saith the Evangelist, that is, the day on which Christ rose from the dead, *at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews.* The second observation was performed voluntarily, *for after eight days again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them:* the first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God, the Disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, *when the day of Pentecost was fully come*, which was also the first day of the week, *they were all with one accord in one place;* and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached

John xx. 19.

John xx. 26.

Acts ii. 1.

Acts ii. 41. the gospel, and the *same day were added* unto them *about three thousand souls.* The same practice of convening we find con-
Acts xx. 7. tinued in the following years: for *upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them:* and the same Apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the saints both to the churches of
1 Cor. xvi. 2. Galatia and of Corinth; *Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him.*

From this resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the *Lord's day,* and is so called by St. John, who says
Rev. i. 10. of himself in the Revelation, *I was in the spirit on the Lord's day.* And thus the observation of that day, which the Jews did sanctify, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour; and in the stead of it the religious observation of that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead[25], by the constant practice of the 266

[25] Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται. *Justin. Mart. Apol.* i. §. 67. [p. 83 D.] *et paulo post,* Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς, ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν. [Ibid. p. 84 A.] This I take to be, without question, that *status dies* which is mentioned by Pliny in his epistle to Trajan: 'Affirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere.' *Lib.* x. *Epist.* 97. 'Nobis, quibus sabbata extranea sunt et neomeniæ et feriæ a Deo aliquando dilectæ — munera commeant? strenæ consonant? lusus, convivia constrepunt? O melior fides nationum in suam sectam, quæ nullam solennitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat! Non Dominicum diem, non Pentecosten, etiam si nossent, nobiscum communicassent.' *Tertul. de Idol. cap.* 14. [p. 94 A.] 'Nam quod in Judaica circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque imagine ante præmissum, sed veniente Christo in veritate completum. Nam quia octavus dies, id est post sabbatum primus dies, futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret et nos vivificaret, et circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret, hic dies octavus, id est, post sabbatum primus et Dominicus, præcessit in imagine.' *S. Cyprian. lib.* iii. *Epist.* 8. [Ep. LIX. p. 98.] Eusebius reports how Constantine taught his soldiers to observe the Lord's day; Ναὶ μὴν καὶ ἡμέραν εὐχῶν ἡγεῖσθαι κατάλληλον, τὴν κυρίαν ἀληθῶς καὶ πρώτην ὄντως κυριακήν τε καὶ σωτήριον, τὴν δὴ καὶ φωτὸς καὶ ζωῆς, ἀθανασίας τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ παντὸς ἐπώνυμον. *Orat. de Laudib. Constant. cap.* 9. [p. 739.] 'Quid est secunda sabbati, nisi Dominica dies quæ sabbatum sequebatur? Dies autem sabbati erat dierum ordine posterior, sanctificatione Legis anterior. Sed ubi finis Legis advenit, qui est Christus Jesus, — et resurrectione sua octavam sanctificavit, cœpit eadem prima esse, quæ octava est, et octava quæ prima; habens ex numeri ordine prærogativam, et ex resurrectione Domini sanctitatem.' *S. Ambros. Enar. in Psal.* xlvii. [§. 1. vol. i. p. 935 E.] 'Dicat aliquis; Si dies observari non licet, et menses, et tempora, et annos, nos quoque simile crimen incurrimus, quartam sabbati observantes, et parasceuen, et diem Dominicam.'

blessed Apostles, was transmitted to the Church of God, and so continued in all ages.

This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognizance of his Church. As God spake by Moses to the Israelites, *Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you;* thereby leaving a mark of distinction upon the Jews, who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was *Jehovah,* who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharaoh: so we must conceive that he hath given us this day as a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance Exod. xxxi. 13.

S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Gal. cap. iv. *v.* 10. [vol. vii. p. 456 D.] And St. Augustin in answer to the same objection; 'Nam nos quoque et Dominicum diem et Pascha solenniter celebramus, et quaslibet alias Christianas dierum festivitates.' *Cont. Adimant. cap.* 16. [§. 3. vol. viii. p. 325 E.] 'Dies Dominicus non Judæis, sed Christianis resurrectione Domini declaratus est, et ex illo habere cœpit festivitatem suam.' *S. August. Epist.* cxix. *cap.* 13. [Epist. LV. 23. vol. ii. p. 136 F.] 'Hæc tamen septima erit sabbatum nostrum, cujus finis non erit vespera, sed Dominicus dies velut octavus æternus, qui Christi resurrectione sacratus est, æternam non solum spiritus, verum etiam corporis requiem præfigurans.' *Idem, de Civit. Dei, lib.* xxii. *cap.* 30. [§. 5. vol. vii. p. 702 E.] 'Dominicum diem Apostoli et Apostolici viri ideo religiosa solennitate habendum sanxerunt, quia in eodem Redemptor noster a mortuis resurrexit: quique ideo Dominicus appellatur, ut in eo a terrenis operibus vel mundi illecebris abstinentes, tantum divinis cultibus serviamus: dantes scilicet diei huic honorem et reverentiam, propter spem resurrectionis nostræ, quam habemus in illa. Nam sicut ipse Dominus Jesus Christus et Salvator resurrexit a mortuis, ita et nos resurrecturos in novissimo die speramus.' *Auctor Serm. de Tempore, Serm.* 251.* 'Sancti doctores ecclesiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici sabbatismi in illam transferre; ut quod ipsi in figura, nos celebraremus in veritate.' *Ibid.* 'Dominica nobis ideo venerabilis est atque solennis, quia in ea Salvator velut sol oriens, discussis Infernorum tenebris, luce resurrectionis emicuit, ac propterea ipsa dies ab hominibus sæculi dies solis vocatur, quod ortus eum Sol justitiæ Christus illuminet.' *Max. Taurin. de Pentecost. Homil.* 3. [p. 27 H.] *Περιέχει οὖν ἡ μὲν παρασκευὴ τὸ πάθος, τὸ σάββατον τὴν ταφὴν, ἡ Κυριακὴ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Auctor Clem. Constitut.* *Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς Ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ· τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν προτιμῶντας, εἴγε δύναιντο, σχολάζειν, ὡς Χριστιανοί· εἰ δὲ εὑρηθεῖεν Ἰουδαΐσται, ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστῷ. Concil. Laodic. Can.* 29. [Mansi ii. p. 570 A.]

* [This Sermon is certainly not Augustin's, and this portion of it is from Alcuin. *de Div. Offic.* c. 27. v. Augustin. Op. vol. v. Append. p. 467 A.]

wrought than that of Egypt; as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater Prophet than our Saviour; as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God; so all which profess the Christian religion are known publicly to belong unto the Church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly separated from all other professions[26].

That Christ did thus rise from the dead, is a most necessary article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and profess, to the meditation whereof the Apostle hath given
2 Tim. ii. 8. a particular injunction, *Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of* 267
David was raised from the dead. First, because without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it, strong. By this we are assured that he which died was the Lord of life; and though he were
2 Cor. xiii. 4. *crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God.* By
Rom. i. 4. this resurrection from the dead, he *was declared to be the Son of God;* and upon the morning of the third day did those words
Acts xiii. 33. of the Father manifest a most important truth, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his resurrection he demonstrated his Divinity.

Secondly, By his resurrection we are assured of the justifica-
Rom. iv. 24, 25. tion of our persons; and *if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead,* it will be *imputed* to us *for righteousness:* for he *was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.* By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the sins for which he suffered were not his own[27]: had no man been a

26 'Quid hac die felicius, in qua Dominus Judæis mortuus est, nobis resurrexit? in qua Synagogæ cultus occubuit, et est ortus Ecclesiæ; in qua nos homines fecit secum surgere et vivere et sedere in cœlestibus, et impletum est illud quod ipse dixit in Evangelio, *Cum autem exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad me?* Hæc est dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus et lætemur in ea. Omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus, sed cæteri dies possunt esse Judæorum, possunt esse Hæreticorum, possunt esse Gentilium; dies Dominica, dies resurrectionis, dies Christianorum, dies nostra est.' *Explan. in Psal.* cxvii. *sub nomine Hieron.*

27 St. Chrysostom excellently upon that place; Ὅρα πῶς τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπὼν τοῦ θανάτου, τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιεῖται. Διὰ τί γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη, φησίν; οὐ δι' οἰκείαν ἁμαρτίαν· καὶ δῆλον ἐκ τῆς ἀναστάσεως· εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἁμαρτωλὸς, πῶς ἀνέστη; εἰ δὲ ἀνέστη, εὔδηλον ὅτι ἁμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἦν· εἰ δὲ ἁμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἦν, πῶς ἐσταυρώθη; δι' ἑτέρους· εἰ δὲ δι' ἑτέρους, πάντως ἀνέστη. [Hom. ix. in Ep. ad Rom. vol. ix. p. 511 D.]

sinner, he had not died; had he been a sinner, he had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins, and justification of our persons: *God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh,* and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. *Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again.*

Rom. viii. 3.

Rom. viii. 33, 34.

Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the resurrection of Christ as an Article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen, and declare our hope. For *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled.* By the resurrection of Christ his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and coheirs with Christ. *For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.* He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the *first-born from the dead,* and we *the sons of the resurrection.* The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head. For *if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.* Thus the resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an efficient, and as an exemplary cause. As an efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; *For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* As an exemplary cause, in regard that all the saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of

1 Pet. i. 3, 4.

Rom. v. 10.

Col. i. 18.

Luke xx. 36.

Rom. viii. 11.

1 Cor. xv. 22.

Rom. vi. 5. Christ; *For if we have been planted together in the likeness of*
Phil. iii. 21. *his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. He shall change our vile bodies, that they may be like unto his glorious* 268
1 Cor. xv. 49. *body:* that *as we have borne the image of the earthy, we may also bear the image of the heavenly.* This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtained the
Mic. ii. 13. power, and is become the pattern of his resurrection. *The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up and have passed through the gate; their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.*

Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his resurrection may effectually work its proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and ex-
Eph. ii. 5. emplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. *When we are*
Rom. vi. 4. *dead in sins,* God *quickeneth us together with Christ.* And, *as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life.* To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen, is to incur that reprehension
Luke xxiv. 5. of the angel, *Why seek ye the living among the dead?* To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or Christ
Matt. viii. 22. is risen from the dead. Let then *the dead bury the dead,* but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he
Eph. v. 14. might live. *Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.* There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection
Rev. xx. 6. of the body. *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in* this *first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.*

Having thus explained the manner of Christ's resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account, as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend, when he makes profession of this part of his Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much; I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself, by reuniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the sabbath, and resting in the grave the sabbath-

day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe *the third day he rose again from the dead.*

269

ARTICLE VI.

He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THIS Article hath received no variation, but only in the addition of the name of *God,* and the attribute *Almighty;* the ancients using it briefly thus, *He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father*[28]. It containeth two distinct parts; one transient, the other permanent; one as the way, the other as the end: the first is Christ's ascension, the second is his session.

In the ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound to us three considerations and no more: the first of the person, *He;* the second of the action, *ascended;* the third of the termination, *into heaven.* Now the person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent Articles, he will afford no different speculation but only in conjunction with this particular action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christ's ascension: first, to shew that the promised Messias was to ascend into heaven; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did really and truly ascend thither; thirdly, to declare what that heaven is, into which he did ascend.

That the promised Messias should ascend into heaven, hath been represented typically, and declared prophetically. The high priest under the Law was an express type of the Messias and his priestly office; the atonement which he made was the representation of the propitiation in Christ for the sins of the

28 'Ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dextram Patris.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 31. p. ccxix.] St. Augustin, *in Enchirid.* Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, *Auctor Expos. Symb. ad Catechumenos,* Venantius Fortunatus, the Latin and Greek MSS. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh. St. Augustin, *de Fide et Symb.* hath it, 'Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris;' to which was afterwards added *omnipotentis.* 'Sedet ad dextram Patris omnipotentis;' *Euseb. Gallican.* [p. 553 G.] 'Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis;' *Etherius Uxam.* [p. 344 E.] *et Auctor Sermonum de Tempore,* the Greek and Latin MSS. in Bennet College Library.

world: for the making this atonement, the high priest was appointed once every year to enter into the holy of holies, and
Lev. xvi. 2. no oftener. For *the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark, that he die not.* None entered into that holy place but the high priest alone; and he himself could enter thither but once in the year; and
Heb. ix. 11, 12. thereby shewed that the *High Priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands,* was to *enter into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.* The Jews did all believe that the tabernacle did signify this world[29], and the holy of holies the highest heavens; wherefore as the high priest did slay the sacrifice, and with the blood thereof did pass through the rest of the tabernacle, and with that blood enter into the holy of holies; so was the Messias here to offer up himself, and being slain to pass through all the courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest heavens, the most glorious seat of the majesty of God. Thus Christ's ascension was represented typically.

The same ascension was also declared prophetically, as we 270
Ps. lxviii. 18. read in the Prophet David. *Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men:* which phrase *on high*[30], in the language of David signifying heaven,

29 Εἴ τις τῆς σκηνῆς κατανοήσειε τὴν πῆξιν, καὶ τοῦ ἱερέως ἴδοι τὴν στολὴν, τά τε σκεύη οἷς περὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν χρώμεθα· τόν τε νομοθέτην εὑρήσει θεῖον ἄνδρα, καὶ ματαίως ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὰς βλασφημίας ἀκούοντας· ἕκαστα γὰρ τούτων εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων, εἴ τις ἀφθόνως ἐθέλοι καὶ μετὰ συνέσεως σκοπεῖν, εὑρήσει γεγονότα. Τήν τε γὰρ σκηνὴν τριάκοντα πηχῶν οὖσαν, νείμας εἰς τρία, καὶ δύο μέρη πᾶσιν ἀνεὶς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὥσπερ βέβηλόν τινα καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀποσημαίνει· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πᾶσίν ἐστιν ἐπίβατα· τὴν δὲ τριτὴν μοίραν μόνῳ περιέγραψε τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις. *Joseph. Jud. Antiq. lib.* iii. *cap.* 8. [c. vii. §. 7.] Where it is to be observed, that the place which St. Paul calls the *first Tabernacle*, Josephus terms *βέβηλόν τινα καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, a common and profane place*, as representing this world in which we live, and our life and conversation here; as the Apostle seems to speak, Heb. ix. 1. Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ δικαιώματα λατρείας, τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν. For ἅγιον κοσμικόν, *sanctum seculare*, or as the Syriac, בית קודשא עלמניא *domus sancta mundana*, may well be that part of the tabernacle which represented this world, and therefore termed common and profane in respect of that more holy part which represented heaven.

30 This place must necessarily be understood of the Messias, by reason of that *high place* to which no other conqueror ascended. For that למרום in the language of the Prophet is attributed to God, as Psal. vii. 8. למרום שובה *Return on high*, that is in the language of the Chaldee Paraphrase, לבי שכנתך תוב *Return to the house of thy majesty;* and Psal. xciii. 4. אדיר במרום יהוה, *The Lord on high is mighty; Chal.* בשמי מרומא, *in the upper heavens;* Psal. lxxi. 19. *Thy righteousness, O Lord, is* עד־מרום, *usque ad excelsum;* the

could be applied properly to no other conqueror but the Messias; not to Moses, not to David, not to Joshua, not to any but the Christ; who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and triumphing over them, to ascend unto the highest heaven, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sons of men. The prophecy of Micah did foretell as much, even in the opinion and confession of the Jews themselves[31], by those words, *The breaker is come up before them: they have broken* Mic. ii. 13. *up and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it; and their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.* And thus Christ's ascension was declared prophetically as well as typically; which was our first consideration.

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised Messias, was truly and really performed by our Jesus. That only-begotten and eternal Son of God, who by his Divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did, by a local translation of his human nature, really and truly ascend from this earth below on which he lived, into the heavens above, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body and the soul with which he lived and died and rose again.

The ascent of Christ into heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but only that he obtained a more heavenly and glorious state or

Chaldee again, עד שמי מרומא. In the same manner in this place, עלית למרום *Thou hast ascended on high,* the Chaldee Paraphrase translateth סלקתא לרקיע *Thou hast ascended the firmament;* and he addeth immediately משה נביא *O thou Prophet Moses:* yet there is a plain contradiction in that interpretation; for if it were meant of Moses, it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament, it cannot be understood of Moses, for he never ascended thither.

31 This *Breaker up* is by the confession of the Jews the title of the Messias. So the author of *Sepher Abchath Rochel* in his description of the coming of the Messias maketh use of this place. And the same appeareth farther by that saying of Moses Haddarshan in *Bereshith Rabba,* נְסִיעָה מלמטה זה אברהם נסיעה מלמעלה זה משיח שנ" עלה הפרץ לפניהם וגו': *The Plantation from below is Abraham, the Plantation from above is Messias, as it is written, The breaker is come up before them,* &c. So he on Gen. xl. 9. Again the same *Bereshith Rabba,* Gen. xliv. 18, אימתי אנו שמחים כשיעמדו רגלי השכינה על הר הזיתים *When shall we rejoice? when the feet of the Shechinah shall stand upon the mount of Olives;* and again, אימתי כשיעלו הגליות מניהנם והשכינה בראשם שנ" ויעבר מלכם לפניהם ויהוה בראשם: *When? when the captives shall ascend from hell, and Shechinah in the head, as it is written,* (Mic. ii. 13.) *Their King shall pass before them, and the Lord in the head of them.**

* [The reputed author of the Abkath Rochel is Machir: his argument on Mic. ii. 13. may be seen translated into Latin in A. Hulsii Theolog. Jud. pp. 143–5. The exposition of Gen. xl. 9. ascribed to Moses Haddarshan is taken from Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 685; and that on Gen. xliv. 18. from the same place.—R. P. S.]

condition after his resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of Christ when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to Mary,
John xx. 17. *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.* Although
John iii. 13. he had said before to Nicodemus, *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven,* even *the Son of man which is in heaven;* which words imply that he had then ascended: yet even those concern not this ascension. For that was therefore only true, because the Son of man, not yet conceived in the Virgin's womb, was not in heaven, and after his conception by virtue of the hypostatical union was in heaven; from whence, speaking after the manner of men, he might well say, that he had ascended into heaven; because whatsoever was first on earth and then in heaven, we say, ascended into heaven. 271
Wherefore, beside that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his resurrection, there was yet another, and that more proper ascension: for after he had both those ways ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of ascension, by which Christ had not yet ascended when he spake to Mary after his resurrection, was not long after to be performed; for at the same time he said
John xx. 17. unto Mary, *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father.* And when this ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man, as man, from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For *when he had spoken unto the* Dis-
Luke xxiv. 50, 51. ciples, *and blessed them,* laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, even *while he blessed them he parted*
Acts i. 9, 10. *from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight,* and so he was *carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up.* This was a visible departure, as it is described, a real removing of that body of Christ which was before present with the Apostles; and that body living after the resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it: and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated

from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

Thus was Christ's ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the Apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended[32]; because an eyewitness was not necessary unto the act of his resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his ascension. It was sufficient that *Christ shewed himself* to the Apostles *alive after his passion;* for being they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again: for whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his resurrection. But being the Apostles were not to see our Saviour in heaven, being the session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eyewitnesses of the act, who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect. Acts i. 3.

Beside the eyewitness of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the angels; those blessed spirits which ministered before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that Christ ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came: and because the eyes of the Apostles could not follow him so far[33], the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception; for *behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* We must therefore acknowledge and confess against all the wild heresies of old[34], that the eternal Acts i. 10, 11.

32 Βλεπόντων μὲν οὐκ ἀνέστη, βλεπόντων δὲ ἐπῄρθη· ἐπειδὰν οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἡ ὕψις τὸ πᾶν ἴσχυσε· καὶ γὰρ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὸ μὲν τέλος εἶδον, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν οὐκέτι· καὶ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν εἶδον, τὸ δὲ τέλος οὐκέτι· παρεῖλκε γὰρ ἐκεῖνο τὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἰδεῖν, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ταῦτα φθεγγομένου παρόντος, καὶ τοῦ μνήματος δηλοῦντος ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ· ἄλλα τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο λόγῳ ἔδει μαθεῖν. *S. Chrysost. Homil. 2. in Act. Apost.* [§. 2. vol. ix. p. 17 B.]

33 Ἐπειδὰν οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ δεῖξαι τὸ ὕψος, οὐδὲ παιδεῦσαι πότερον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνῆλθεν, ἢ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὅρα τί γίνεται· ὅτι μὲν αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἤδεσαν ἐξ ὧν διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτοὺς (πόρρωθεν γὰρ οὐκ ἐνῆν ἰδόντας γνῶναι)· ὅτι δὲ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναλαμβάνεται, αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν ἐδίδασκον οἱ ἄγγελοι. *S. Chrysost. Homil. 2. in Act. Apost.* [vol. ix. p. 17 D.]

34 The various heresies in the primitive times, concerning the humanity of Christ ascended into heaven, are briefly touched by Tertullian; 'Ut et illi erubescant, qui adfirmant carnem in cœlis vacuam sensu, ut vaginam exempto Christo sedere: aut qui carnem et animam tantundem, aut tantummodo animam, carnem vero non jam.' *De Carne Christi, cap.* 24. [p. 325 B.] Of which

Son of God, who died and rose again, did with the same body and soul, with which he died and rose, ascend up to heaven; which was the second particular considerable in this Article.

Thirdly, being the name of *heaven* admitteth divers acceptions 272
in the sacred Scriptures, it will be necessary to inquire what is the true notion of it in this Article, and what was the proper termination of Christ's ascension. In some sense it might be truly said Christ was in heaven before the cloud took him out of the Apostles' sight; for the clouds themselves are called the clouds of heaven: but that heaven is the first; and our Saviour certainly ascended at least as far as St. Paul was caught up, that
Heb. iv. 14. is, into the third heaven; for *we have a great High Priest that is passed through the heavens*[35]. And needs must he pass through
Heb. vii. 26. the heavens, because he was *made higher than the heavens;* for
Eph. iv. 10. *he that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens.* When therefore Christ is said to have ascended into heaven, we must take that word as signifying as much as the heaven of heavens; and so Christ is ascended through and
Heb. vi. 19. above the heavens, and yet is still in heaven: for he is *entered into that within the veil,* there is his passage through the heavens:
Heb. ix. 12, 24. *into the holy place, even into heaven itself, to appear in the presence*
Isa. lxvi. 1. *of God,* this is the heaven of heavens. For *thus* said *the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool;* and as Christ descended unto the footstool of his Father in his humiliation, so he ascended unto the throne of his Father in his exalt-

Gregory Nazianzen, Εἴ τις ἀποτεθεῖσθαι νῦν τὴν ἁγίαν σάρκα λέγοι, καὶ γυμνὴν εἶναι τὴν θεότητα τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ προσλήμματος καὶ εἶναι καὶ ἥξειν, μὴ ἴδοι τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρουσίας. *Epist.* 1. *ad Cledonium.* [Ep. ci. vol. ii. p. 86 E.] The Apellitæ taught that Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and so ascended into heaven without it; 'Hunc Apellem dicunt quidam etiam de Christo tam falsa sensisse, ut diceret eum, non quidem carnem deposuisse de cœlo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse, quam mundo reddidit, cum sine carne resurgens ascendit in cœlum.' *S. August. Hæres.* 23. [vol. viii. p. 9 E.] This opinion of Apelles is thus delivered by Epiphanius in his own words: Ἐν τῷ ἔρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπουρανίων ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ συνήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων σῶμα—Ἔδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν παθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτὴν τὴν σάρκα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς· καὶ ἀναλύσας, φησὶν, αὐτὴν τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀπεμέρισε πάλιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν στοιχείων τὸ ἴδιον ἀποδοὺς, τὸ θερμὸν τῷ θερμῷ, τὸ ψυχρὸν τῷ ψυχρῷ, τὸ ξηρὸν τῷ ξηρῷ, τὸ ὑγρὸν τῷ ὑγρῷ· καὶ οὕτως διαλύσας ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν τὸ ἔνσαρκον σῶμα, ἀνέπτη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὅθεν καὶ ἦκε. *Hæres.* xliv. §. 2. [vol. i. pp. 381 D, 382 B.] Of whom Gregory Nazianzen is to be understood in that Epistle before cited,—ἢ εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ἐχέθη καὶ διελύθη, ὡς φωνῆς φύσις, καὶ ὀδμῆς ῥύσις, καὶ ἀστραπῆς δρόμος οὐχ ἱσταμένης.

35 We read it indeed *into the heavens*, but the original imports as much as *through;* διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς· *Vulg. qui penetravit cœlos.*

ation. This was the place of which our Saviour spake to his Disciples, *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* Had he been there before in body, it had been no such wonder that he should have ascended thither again: but that his body should ascend unto that place where the majesty of God was most resplendent; that the flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone should be seated far above all angels and archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God; this was that which Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens; whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies; whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above, into that place did he ascend, where in the splendour of his Deity he *was before* he took upon him our humanity. John vi. 62.

As therefore when we say Christ ascended, we understand a literal and local ascent, not of his Divinity (which possesseth all places, and therefore being everywhere is not subject to the imperfection of removing any whither), but of his humanity, which was so in one place that it was not in another: so when we say the place into which he ascended was heaven, and from the expositions of the Apostles must understand thereby the heaven of heavens, or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the soul of Christ to have passed far above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the sun[36].

273 It was necessary to profess this Article of Christ's ascension:

[36] The Seleuciani and Hermiani taught that the body of Christ ascended no farther than the sun, in which it was deposited; of whom Philastrius, and out of him St. Augustin thus; 'Negant Salvatorem in carne sedere ad dexteram Patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eamque in sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de Psalmo, *In sole posuit tabernaculum suum.*' *Hæres.* 59. [vol. viii. p. 20 D.] The same opinion Gregory Nazianzen attributeth to the Manicheans; Ποῦ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα νῦν, εἰ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ προσλαβόντος; οὐ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τοὺς Μανιχαίων λήρους τῷ ἡλίῳ ἐναποτέθειται, ἵνα τιμηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἀτιμίας. *Epist.* I. *ad Cledonium.* [Ep. CI. vol. ii. p. 86 C.] And St. Austin says they taught the sun to be Christ; 'Manichæi solem istum oculis carnis visibilem, expositum, et publicum, non tantum hominibus, sed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Christum Dominum esse putaverunt.' *Tract.* 34. *in Joan.* [vol. iii. part ii. p. 534 C.] This opinion is more clearly set down, but without a name, in the *Catena Patrum* on the 18th Psalm; Οὐ γὰρ προσεκτέον τοῖς τῶν Αἱρετικῶν φληνάφοις, οἵ φασιν ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁ σωτὴρ ἐν τῇ ἡλιακῇ σφαίρᾳ ἀπέθετο ὃ ἐφόρησε σῶμα, φυλάττεσθαι μέχρι τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας. This was the old heresy of Hermogenes, as is related by Theodoret; Οὗτος [ὁ Ἑρμογένης] τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ εἶπεν ἀποτεθῆναι, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας εἰς τὴν ὕλην ἀναχεθήσεσθαι. *Hæret. Fab. lib.* i. *cap.* 19. [vol. iv. p. 207 D.]

first, for the confirmation and augmentation of our faith. Our faith is thereby confirmed, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father: his Father sent him, and we have received the message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for delivering it. Our faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being *the evidence of things not seen.* The further the object is removed from us, the more of faith hath that act which embraceth it[37]: Christ said unto Thomas, *Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed:* and that blessedness by his ascension he hath left to the whole Church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our faith; and by virtue of his being in heaven, our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown of our faith: because he ascended, we the more believe; and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

Heb. xi. 1.

John xx. 29.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but being our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him. He is our Head, and where that is, the members may expect admission[38]: for in so great and intimate an union there is no fear of separation or exclusion: *there are many mansions in* his *Father's house.* And when he spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his Disciples, *I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.* The first-fruits of our nature are

John xiv. 2.

[37] 'Magnarum hic vigor est mentium, et valde fidelium lumen est animarum incunctanter credere, quæ corporeo non videntur intuitu, et ibi figere desiderium, quo nequeas inferre conspectum. Hæc autem pietas, unde in nostris cordibus nasceretur, aut quomodo quisquam justificaretur per fidem, si in iis tantum salus nostra consisteret, quæ obtutibus subjacerent?' *Leo de Ascens. Serm.* 2. [Serm. lxxii. cap. 1. vol. i. p. 314.] 'Fides, qua eorum qui Deum visuri sunt, quamdiu peregrinantur, corda mundantur, quod non videt credit; nam si vides, non est fides: credenti colligitur meritum, videnti redditur præmium. Eat ergo Dominus et paret locum; eat ne videatur, lateat ut credatur: tunc enim locus paratur, si ex fide vivatur: creditus desideretur, ut desideratus habeatur, desiderium dilectionis, præparatio est mansionis.' *S. August. Tract.* 68. *in Joan.* [§. 3. p. 680 D.]

[38] 'Christi ascensio nostra provectio est, et quo præcessit gloria capitis, eo spes vocatur et corporis.' *Leo de Ascens. Serm.* 1. [vol. i. p. 313.]

ascended[39], and the rest is sanctified. This is the *new and living* Heb. x. 20.
way which he consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say,
his flesh. And hence we *have our hope as an anchor of the soul* Heb. vi. 19,
both sure and stedfast, which entereth into that within the veil, 20.
whither the forerunner is for us entered. For if Christ in his ascension be the forerunner, then are there some to follow after[40]; and not only so, but they which follow are to go in the same way, and to attain unto the same place: and if this *forerunner* be *entered for us*, then we are they which are to follow and to overtake him there; as being of the same nature, members of the same body, branches of the same vine, and therefore he went thither before us as the first-fruits before those that follow, and we hope to follow him as coming late to the same perfection.

274 As therefore *God hath quickened us together with Christ, and* Eph. ii. 5, 6.
hath raised us up together by virtue of his resurrection; so hath he also *made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*, by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there in him[41], and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our

39 Διὰ τοῦτο ἑορτάζειν ὀφείλομεν, ἐπειδὰν σήμερον τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου φυράματος, τουτέστι, τὴν σάρκα, ἐν οὐρανοῖς Χριστὸς ἀνήγαγε. *S. Chrysost. Orat.* 1. *de Ascens.* Διὸ λοιπὸν χρηστὰς ἔχομεν τὰς ἐλπίδας, πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀπαρχὴν ἀφορῶντες. *Idem, Orat.* 2. *de Ascens.*

40 There is a double notion of πρόδρομος, to this purpose; one of a man sent before to make preparations for others which follow; in which it is well observed by St. Chrysostom, Ὁ δὲ πρόδρομος, τινῶν ἐστι πρόδρομος· ὥσπερ Ἰωάννης τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν ἁπλῶς, εἰσῆλθεν, ἀλλ', ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν· ὡς καὶ ἡμῶν ὀφειλόντων καταλαβεῖν. Οὐ πολὺ γὰρ τοῦ προδρόμου καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων ὀφείλει εἶναι τὸ μέσον· ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἂν εἴη πρόδρομος· τὸν γὰρ πρόδρομον καὶ τοὺς ἑπομένους ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ χρὴ εἶναι ὁδῷ· καὶ τὸν μὲν ὁδεύειν, τοὺς δὲ ἐπικαταλαμβάνειν. *Homil.* 11. *in Epist. ad Hebr.* [§. 2. vol. xii. p. 114 C.] Another notion there is among the Greeks of the fruit which is ripe and come to perfection before the rest, as Isaiah xxviii. 4. Καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκπεσὸν τῆς ἐλπίδος τῆς δόξης, ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ· ὡς πρόδρομος σύκου. בכורה *tanquam primitiæ*, or *fructus primogeniti, ficus præcox.* Hesychius, Πρόδρομα, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄξονι ξύλα, ἢ τὰ προακμάζοντα σῦκα· *lege* πρόδρομοι; for they indeed are properly τὰ προακμάζοντα σῦκα, *præcoces ficus*: for so Theophrastus, speaking particularly περὶ συκῆς, hath these words; Ὑπολειπομένης γὰρ πλείονος τῆς τοιαύτης ὑγρότητος, ὅταν ἀὴρ ἐπιγένηται μαλακὸς καὶ ὑγρὸς καὶ θερμὸς, ἐξεκαλέσατο τὴν βλάστησιν· ὅτε δὲ τοῦτο συμβαίνει φανερὸν, ὅτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ μέρους, ὁ καρπὸς, ἀνίεται, ὅθεν καὶ οἱ πρόδρομοι. *De causis Plant. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. *et paulo post*, Πάλιν δὲ τοὺς προδρόμους αἱ μὲν φέρουσιν, οἷον, ἥ τε Λακωνικὴ καὶ Λέυκομφάλιος, καὶ ἕτεραι πλείους· αἱ δ' οὐ φέρουσι. The first fruits of the early figs were called πρόδρομοι, and the tree which bare them προτερική. Now as this early fruit doth forerun the latter fruit of the same tree, and comes to ripeness and perfection in its kind before the rest; so our Saviour goes before those men of the same nature with him, and they follow in their time to the maturity of the same perfection.

41 Τῆς κεφαλῆς καθεζομένης καὶ τὸ σῶμα συγκάθηται· διὰ τοῦτο ἐπήγαγεν, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [vol. xi. p. 27 B.]

Head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up into fruition.

Thirdly, the profession of faith in Christ ascended, is neces-
Matt. vi. 21. sary for the exaltation of our affections. *For where* our *treasure*
John xii. 32. *is, there will* our *hearts be also. If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me,* saith our Saviour; and if those words were true of his crucifixion, how powerful ought they to
2 Kings ii. 1, 2. be in reference to his ascension? *When the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven, Elisha said unto him, As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee:* when Christ is ascended up on high, we must follow him with the wings of our medita-
Col. iii. 1, 2, 3. tions, and with the chariots of our affections. *If we be risen with Christ,* we must *seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.* If we be *dead,* and our *life hid in Christ with God, we must set our affection on things above, not on things on the earth.* Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us, that we are strangers and pilgrims here, as all our fathers were, and that another country belongs unto us: from
1 Pet. ii. 11. whence we *as strangers and pilgrims* should learn *to abstain*
Phil. iii. 19, 20. *from fleshly lusts;* and not *mind earthly things;* as knowing that we are *citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour, the*
Eph. ii. 19. *Lord Jesus,* yea *fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.* We should trample upon our sins, and subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conversation may be correspondent to our Saviour's condition; that where the eyes of the Apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

Fourthly, the ascension of Christ is a necessary Article of the Creed in respect of those great effects which immediately were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed Apostles had never preached the Gospel, had they not been endued with power from above; but none of that power had they received, if the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner had not descended: and the Holy Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself, when he was to depart from his Disciples, grounded the necessity of his
John xvi. 7. departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you.* Now if all the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe, depend upon the certain information which the Apostles had, and those Apostles appear

to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues had sat upon them, it was first absolutely necessary that the Holy Ghost should so descend. Again, being it was impossible that the Spirit of God in that manner should come down, until the Son of God had ascended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate
275 had entered upon his office in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confess that ascension.

Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confess in those words of our Creed, *he ascended into heaven:* for thereby he is understood to express thus much; I am fully persuaded, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial orbs, until he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the majesty of God. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who *ascended into heaven.*

And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THIS second part of the Article containeth two particulars; the session of the Son, and the description of the Father: the first sheweth that Christ upon his ascension is set down *at the right hand of God;* the second assureth us that the God, at whose right hand Christ is set down, is the *Father Almighty.*

For the explication of Christ's session, three things will be necessary; first, to prove that the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God; secondly, to shew that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, is set down at the right hand of God; thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to Christ.

That the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God, was both pre-typified and foretold. Joseph, who was betrayed and sold by his brethren, was an express type of Christ; and though in many things he represented the Messias, yet in none more than in this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the supreme power of Egypt. For thus Pharaoh

Gen. xli. 40, 42, 43. spake to Joseph, *Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck: and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt.* Thus Joseph had the execution of all the regal power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, only the authority by which he moved remained in Pharaoh still. This was a clear representation of the Son of man, who, by his sitting on the right hand of God, obtained power to rule and govern all things both in heaven and earth, (especially as the *ruler of his house*, that is, the Church,) with express command that all things both in heaven and earth, and under the earth, should bow down before him: but all this in the name of the Father; to whom the throne is still reserved, in whom the original authority still remains. And thus the session of the Messias was pre-typified.

Ps. cx. 1. The same was also expressly foretold, not only in the sense, but in the phrase. *The Lord said unto my Lord,* saith the Prophet David, *Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this prophecy, but with no success: some make the person to whom 276
God speaks to be Ezechias[42], some Abraham[43], some Zorobabel, others David[44]; others the people of Israel[45]: and because the

42 This Justin Martyr testifies of the Jews in his age; Καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ψαλμὸν ὅτι εἰς τὸν Ἐζεχίαν τὸν βασιλέα εἰρῆσθαι ἐξηγεῖσθαι τολμᾶτε, οὐκ ἀγνοῶ, ἐπεῖπον. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 33. [p. 130 B.] And out of him Tertullian, citing this Psalm; 'Sed necesse est, ad meam sententiam pertinere defendam eas Scripturas, quas et Judæi nobis avocare conantur. Dicunt denique hunc Psalmum in Ezechiam cecinisse, quia is sederit ad dextram templi, et hostes ejus averterit Deus et absumpserit.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* v. *c.* 9. [p. 472 B.]

43 So St. Chrysostom, speaking of the Jews; Τίνα οὖν ἐκεῖνοι τὸν λέγοντά φασι; τὸν Θεόν· τὸν δὲ ἀκούοντα; τὸν Ἀβραάμ· ἕτεροι δὲ τὸν Ζοροβάβελ, καὶ ἄλλοι ἕτερον. *Ad locum.* [vol. v. p. 249 D.] *Ita Catena Græca,* Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι, τὸ γελοιότερον, εἰς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ (εἰρῆσθαι λέγουσι·) καθῆσθαι ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. And this exposition is now followed by Solomon Jarchi and Lipmannus; Jarchi acknowledging it to be ancient, רבותינו דרשוהו באברהם אבינו ואני אפרשנו כדבריהם נאם יי" לאברהם׃

44 This is the exposition of the later Rabbins, as of Aben Ezra and David Kimchi, who attribute the subject of the Psalm to David. And not only they, but the ancienter Rabbins since our Saviour's time, as appeareth by those words of St. Chrysostom; Καὶ τὰ ἐπιόντα δὲ δηλοῖ, ὅτι οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ ἐνταῦθα εἴρηται, οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ Δαβίδ· οὐ-

prophecy cannot belong to him who made the Psalm, therefore they which attribute the prediction to Abraham tell us the Psalm was penned by his steward Eliezer[46]: they which expound it of David say that one of his musicians was author of it.

But first, it is most certain that David was the penman of this Psalm; the title speaks as much, which is, *A Psalm of David*[47]: from whence it followeth that the prediction did not belong to him, because it was spoken to his Lord. Nor could it indeed belong to any of the rest which the Jews imagine, because neither Abraham nor Ezechias nor Zorobabel[48] could be the Lord of David, much less the people of Israel, (to whom some of the Jews referred it,) who were not the lords but the subjects of that David. Beside, he which is said to *sit at the right hand of God*, is also said to be *a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck:* but neither Abraham nor Ezechias, nor any which the Jews have mentioned, was ever any priest of God[49]. Again, our Saviour urged this Scripture against the Pharisees, *saying, What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? and no man was able to answer him a word.* From whence it is evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most

Ps. cx. 4.

Matt. xxii. 42–46.

δεῖς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἱερωσύνῃ τετίμηται. *Ad locum.* [vol. v. p. 249 E.]

45 Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἕτερά τινα λέγουσι τούτων ἐωλότερα· περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ λέγουσι ταῦτα εἰρῆσθαι· *et paulo post,* Πῶς δ' ἂν ἢ τῷ Δαβὶδ, ἢ τῷ Ζοροβάβελ, ἢ τῷ λαῷ ταῦτα ἁρμόσειεν; *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [vol. v. p. 250.]

46 To which purpose saith St. Chrysostom, concerning the Jews of his time, Τί γάρ φασιν ἄλλοι πάλιν; ὅτι ὁ παῖς τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ταῦτα λέγει περὶ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ. *Ad locum.* [ibid.]

47 As for that objection which is made by Aben Ezra, that it is not the Psalm of David, but penned for and in the honour of David, because the title is לדוד מזמור as if it were a Psalm *for* David, not *of* David: it is by no means to be admitted, because it may not only very well signify a Psalm made by David, but if it do not, there is no title which shews any Psalm to be his, and some of them we are sure are his: Luke xx. 42.

48 Τί οὖν, εἰπέ μοι, Ζοροβάβελ κύριος τοῦ Δαβίδ; καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον; ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἀντὶ μεγάλης τιμῆς Δαβὶδ κέκληται; *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [vol. v. p. 249 E.]

49 This is the argument which the Fathers used against the Jews; as Justin Martyr, in opposition to their pretence of Ezechias; Ἱερεὺς δὲ ὅτι οὔτε γέγονεν Ἐζεχίας, οὔτε ἐστὶν αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀντειπεῖν τολμήσετε· *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 33. [p. 130 C.] and from him Tertullian; 'Quod et in ipso hic accedit, *Tu es Sacerdos in ævum.* Nec sacerdos autem Ezechias, nec in ævum, etsi fuisset. *Secundum ordinem,* inquit, *Melchisedech.* Quid Ezechias ad Melchisedech Altissimi sacerdotem, et quidem non circumcisum?' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* v. *cap.* 9. [p. 472 B.] and so St. Chrysostom in the words before mentioned.

accurate and skilful amongst them, did interpret this Psalm of the Messias; for if they had conceived the prophecy belonged either to Abraham or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of David. It was therefore the general opinion of the Church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers Rabbins[50] since his death, that this prediction did concern the kingdom of Christ. And thus the session of the Messias at the right hand of God was not only represented typically, but foretold prophetically: which is our first consideration.

Secondly, we affirm that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true Messias, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit down at the right hand of God. 277
His ascension was the way to his session, and his session the
Mark xvi. 19. end of his ascension; as the Evangelist expresseth it, *He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God;* or as
Eph. i. 20. the Apostle, God *raised* Christ *from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly* places. There could be no such
Acts ii. 34, 35, 36. session without an ascension: and *David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly,* let all the blind and wilful Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand, neither Abraham or David, neither Ezechias or Zorobabel, but *hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ.*

This was an honour never given, never promised to any man but the Messias: the glorious spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them set down at the right hand of God.
Heb. i. 13. For *to which of his angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?* But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the council of the chief priests and the elders of the people, when he foresaw his death

50 As in the *Midrash Tillim,* Psalm xviii. 36. אר" יודן בשר" חמא לעתיד לבוא הקבה" מושיב מלך המשיח לימינו שנ" נאם יי' לאדני שב לימיני: *R. Joden in the name of Rabbi Chama said that in the time to come God shall place Messias the king at his right hand, as it is written* (Psalm cx. 1.), *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand.* So Moses Haddarshan on Gen. xviii. 1, *Hereafter God holy and blessed shall set the king Messias* לימינו *on his right hand, as it is written* (Psal. cx.), *The Lord said,* &c. [Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 381.]

contrived, and his cross prepared, even then he expressed the confidence of his expectation, saying, *Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.* And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised Messias, *is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God.* Which was our second consideration.

Luke xxii. 69.

1 Pet. iii. 22.

Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto Christ. The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically: first, therefore, we must consider what is the *right hand of God*, in the language of the Scriptures; secondly, what it is to *sit* down at that right hand. God being a spirit can have no material or corporeal parts; and consequently as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no hands at all[51]: but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity, and not only to speak by the mouths of men, but also after the manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most active, and executive of our power[52]; by those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power, is signified by the hand of God. Moreover being by a general custom of the world the right hand is more used than the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the *right hand* of God signifieth the exceeding great and infinite power of God.

Again, because the most honourable place amongst men is the right hand, (as when Bathsheba went unto king Solomon, he *sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's*

1 Kings ii. 19.

51 'Credimus etiam quod *sedet ad dextram Patris.* Nec ideo tamen quasi humana forma circumscriptum esse Deum Patrem arbitrandum est, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut sinistrum latus animo occurrat.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap.* 7. [§. 14. vol. vi. p. 157 C.]

52 'Succedunt brachia et validi lacertorum tori, validæ ad operandum manus, et proceribus digitis habiles ad tenendum. Hinc aptior usus operandi, hinc scribendi elegantia, et ille calamus scribæ velociter scribentis, quo divinæ vocis exprimuntur oracula. Manus est quæ cibum ori ministrat: manus est quæ præclaris enitet factis, quæ conciliatrix divinæ gratiæ sacris infertur altaribus, per quam offerimus et sumimus sacramenta cœlestia: manus est quæ operatur pariter atque dispensat divina mysteria, cujus vocabulo non dedignatus est se Dei Filius declarari, dicente David, *Dextra Domini exaltavit me.* Manus est quæ fecit omnia, sicut dixit Deus omnipotens, *Nonne manus mea fecit hæc omnia?*' *S. Ambros. Hexaem. lib.* vi. *c.* 9. [§. 69. vol. i. p. 140 B.]

mother, and she sate on his right hand,) therefore the *right hand* of God signifies the glorious majesty of God.

Thirdly, Because the gifts of men are given and received by
Jam. i. 17. the hands of men, and *every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights,* therefore the *right hand* of God is the place of celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the Psalmist, 278
Ps. xvi. 11. *In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand pleasures for evermore.*

Now as to the first acception of the *right hand* of God, Christ is said to sit down at the *right hand* of the Father in regard of that absolute power and dominion which he hath obtained in
Matt. xxvi. 64. heaven; from whence it is expressly said, *Hereafter ye shall see*
Mark xiv. 62. *the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power.*
Luke xxii. 69. As to the second acception, Christ is said to sit on the *right hand* of God in regard of that honour[53], glory, and majesty,
Heb. i. 3. which he hath obtained there; wherefore it is said, *When he had by himself purged our sins, he sate down on the right hand of the*
Heb. viii. 1. *Majesty on high:* and again, *We have an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.*

In reference to the third acception, Christ is said to sit on the *right hand* of God, because now after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after his stripes and buffetings, after a painful and shameful death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity[54].

As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his *session,* we must not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs: for we read in the Scriptures a more general term,

53 'Secundum consuetudinem nostram illi consessus offertur, qui aliquo opere perfecto victor adveniens honoris gratia promeretur, ut sedeat. Ita ergo et homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolum superans, resurrectione sua inferna reserans, tanquam perfecto opere ad cœlos victor adveniens, audit a Deo Patre, *Sede ad dextram meam.*' *Max. Taurin. Homil.* 1. *de Pentecoste.* [p. 27 A.]

54 '*Ad dextram* intelligendum est sic dictum esse, in summa beatitudine, ubi justitia et pax et gaudium est.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap.* 7. [p. 157 D.] 'Quid est Patris dextera, nisi æterna illa ineffabilisque felicitas, quo pervenit Filius hominis, etiam carnis immortalitate percepta?' *Idem, cont. Serm. Arian. cap.* 12. [vol. viii. p. 632 G.] 'Beatus est, et a beatitudine, quæ dextera Patris vocatur, ipsius beatitudinis nomen est, dextera Patris.' *De Symb. ad Catechum. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [vol. vi. p. 553 D.] 'Salus temporalis et carnalis in sinistra est, salus æterna cum Angelis in dextra est. Ideo jam in ipsa immortalitate positus Christus, dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in seipso dextram aut sinistram; sed dextra Dei dicitur felicitas illa, quæ quoniam ostendi oculis non potest, tale nomen accepit.' *S. August. in Psal.* cxxxvii. [§. 14. vol. iv. p. 1532 C.]

which signifies only his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular manner of his presence. So St. Paul, *Who is even at the right hand of God;* and St. Peter, *Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God.* Beside, we find him expressed in another position than that of session: for Stephen *looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.* He appeared standing unto Stephen, whom we express sitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occasion, than a diversity of position. He appeared standing[55] to Stephen, as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to receive him: and he is oftener expressed *sitting,* not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effects and operation.

Rom. viii. 34. 1 Pet. iii. 22. Acts vii. 55, 56.

279 This phrase then to *sit,* prescinding from the corporal posture of session, may signify no more than habitation, possession, permansion, and continuance; as the same word in the Hebrew

55 Ἐπεὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν καθῆσθαι φορτικὸν αὐτοῖς ἦν, τέως τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως κινεῖ λόγον, καί φησιν αὐτὸν ἱστασθαι. *S. Chrysost. Homil.* 18. *in Act. Apost.* [§. 1. vol. ix. p. 143 E.] 'Si major gratia et manifestior intelligentia in novo est quam in vetere Testamento, quare Esaias Propheta sedentem in throno majestatis vidit Dominum Sabaoth?—in novo autem Stephanus primus martyr stantem se vidisse dicit Jesum a dextris Dei? Quid est istud, ut hic subjectus videatur post triumphos, et illic quasi Dominus antequam vinceret? Prout causa fecit, ita et Dominus se ostendit. Prophetæ enim visus est quasi rex corripiens plebem; et hoc se ostendit quod erat, hoc est, sedentem. In pace enim erat causa divinitatis ejus. Stephano autem ut stans appareret, fecit calumnia Judæorum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris causa vim patiebatur. Ideo sedente judice Deo, stans apparuit, quasi cui causam diceret; et quia bona causa ejus est, ad dextram judicis erat. Omnis qui causam dicit, stet necesse est.' *S. August. Quæst. in Nov. Test.* 88.* 'Sedere judicantis est, stare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis—Hunc post ascensionem Marcus sedere describit, quia post ascensionis suæ gloriam Judex in fine videbitur. Stephanus vero in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit, quem adjutorem habuit.' *Greg. Magn. Homil.* 29. *in Evang.* [vol. i. p. 1572 D.] Maximus Taurinensis moves the question, 'Quæ sit ratio quod idem Dominus a David sedens prophetatur, stans vero a Stephano prædicatur?' and then renders this reason, 'Ut modo ejus omnipotentia, modo misericordia describatur. Nam utique pro potestate regis sedere dicitur, pro bonitate intercessoris stare suggeritur. Ait enim beatus Apostolus, quia *Advocatum habemus apud Patrem Jesum Christum.* Judex ergo est Christus cum residet, advocatus est cum assurgit. Judex plane Judæis, advocatus Christianis. Hic enim stans apud Patrem, Christianorum licet peccantium causas exorat; ibi residet cum Patre Pharisæorum persequentium peccata condemnans. Illis indignans vehementer ulciscitur, his interveniens leniter miseretur. Hic stat ut suscipiat Stephani martyris spiritum; ibi residet ut condemnet Judæ proditoris admissum.' *Homil.* 1. *de Pentecoste.* [p. 27 B.]

* [This is not a genuine work of Augustin. Vol. iii. part ii. Append. p. 80 D.]

and Greek languages often signifies[56]. And thus our Saviour is set down at the right hand of God in heaven; because he which dwelt with us before on earth, is now ascended up into heaven, and hath taken his mansion or habitation there; and so hath he seated himself, and dwelleth[57] in the highest heavens.

Mic. iv. 4. Again, the notion of *sitting* implieth rest, quietness, and undisturbance; according to that promise in the Prophet, *They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.* So Christ is ascended into heaven, where resting from all pains and sorrows, he is seated free from all disturbance and opposition; God having placed him at his right hand, until he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Heb. xii. 2. Ps. cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25. Thirdly, This *sitting* implieth yet more than quietness or continuance, even dominion, sovereignty, and majesty[58]; as when Solomon sate in the throne of his father, he reigned over Israel after the death of his father. And thus Christ *is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.* And St. Paul did well interpret those words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,* saying, *He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

56 ישב which properly signifieth *to sit,* is familiarly used for *permansit,* and *habitavit;* as Judges v. 17. אשר ישב לחוף ימים LXX. Ἀσὴρ ἐκάθισε παραλίαν θαλασσῶν. *Asher continued on the sea-shore;* Lev. viii. 35. ופתח אהל מועד תשבו יומם ולילה שבעת ימים Καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου καθήσεσθε ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα· *Therefore shall ye abide at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, day and night, seven days.* Upon which place St. Augustin; 'Quid est quod dicit Moyses ad Aaron et filios ejus, cum sanctificantur ad ineundum sacerdotium, *Ad ostium tabernaculi testimonii sedebitis septem dies, die et nocte, ne moriamini?* Numquid nam credibile est, situ corporis uno loco sedere præceptos per dies septem die et nocte, unde se omnino non commoverent? Nec tamen hinc tanquam allegorice aliquid significatum, quod non fieret, sed intelligeretur, cogendi sumus accipere; sed potius agnoscere locutionem Scripturarum, ubi sessionem pro habitatione et commoratione ponit. Non enim quia dictum est de Semei, quod *sederit in Jerusalem annos tres,* ideo putandum est per totum illud tempus in sella sedisse et non surrexisse. Hinc et sedes dicuntur, ubi habent commorationem quorum sedes sunt: habitatio quippe hoc nomen accepit.' *Quæst. super Levit.* 24. [vol. iii. p. 500 F.] And this is as familiar with the Latins as the Hebrews: 'Si [venti] essent, nos Corcyræ non sederemus.' *Cic. Epist. ad Famil. lib.* xvi. 7. 'Id horreum fuit præsidium Pœnis sedentibus ad Trebiam.' *Liv. lib.* xxi. *cap.* 40.

57 *Sedet ad dextram Patris:* credite. Sedere, intelligite habitare: quomodo dicimus de quocunque homine, In illa patria sedit per tres annos. Dicit illud et Scriptura, sedisse quendam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid sedit, et nunquam surrexit? Ideo hominum habitationes sedes dicuntur. Ubi habentur sedes, numquid semper sedetur? Non surgitur, non ambulatur, non jacetur? et tamen sedes vocantur. Sic ergo credite habitare Christum in dextera Dei Patris: ibi est.' *S. August. de Symb. ad Catechum. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [§. 10. vol. vi. p. 553 C.]

58 'Ipsum verbum *sedere* regni significat potestatem.' *S. Hieron. Com. ad Eph. cap.* i. *ver.* 20. [vol. vii. p. 565 D.]

Fourthly, This *sitting* doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of judicature, and so especially expresseth *a king that sitteth in the throne of judgment*; as it is written, *In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness.* And so Christ sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead[59]. Thus to *sit* doth not signify any peculiar inclination or flection, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happiness of condition, regal and judiciary power; as in other authors such significations are usual[60]. Prov. xx. 8. Isa. xvi. 5.

280 The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediator's solemn entry upon his regal office, as to the execution of that full dominion which was due unto him. For *worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.* Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* For because *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.* And this obedience and Rev. v. 12. Matt. xxviii. 18. Phil. ii. 8, 9, 10.

59 '*Sedere* quod dicitur Deus, non membrorum positionem, sed judiciariam significat potestatem, qua illa majestas nunquam caret, semper digna dignis tribuendo; quamvis in extremo judicio multo manifestius inter homines unigeniti Filii Dei judicis vivorum atque mortuorum claritas indubitata futura sit.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap.* 7. [§. 14. vol. vi. p. 157 E.] 'Hoc quod Filius dicitur sedere ad dextram Patris, demonstratur quod ipse homo, quem suscepit Christus, potestatem acceperit judicantis.' *Auctor lib.* iii. *de Symb. ad Catechum. cap.* 7. [§. 7. vol. vi. p. 573.]

60 Most anciently *sedere* did signify no more than *esse*, to be in any place: as Servius noteth on that place of Virgil; Æneid. ix. 3.

——— *Luco tum forte parentis*
Pilumni Turnus sacrata valle sedebat.

'Sedebat, ut Asper dicit, *erat*: quæ clausula antiqua est, et de usu remota.' And then he goes on to shew that *sedere* is taken for that which men were wont to do sitting. 'Secundum Plautum autem *sedere* est consilium capere, qui inducit in *Mostellaria* servum dicentem, *Sine juxta aram sedeam et dabo meliora consilia.* Sed secundum augures, *sedere* est augurium captare: namque post designatas cœli partes a sedentibus captantur auguria: quod et ipse supra ostendit latenter, inducens Picum solum sedentem, ut, vii. 187.

——— *Parvaque sedebat*
Succinctus trabea—

Quod est augurum, cum alios stantes induxerit: ergo *sedebat*, aut erat, aut consilia capiebat, aut augurabatur.'

submission was and is due unto him, because God *raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet; and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.*

Eph. i. 20, 21, 22.

There was an express promise made by God to David, *Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditional: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, *Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore.* Notwithstanding this promise the kingdom of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the kingdom was first rent from his posterity, next the regality itself; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but only ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of David did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of David was not by an uninterrupted lineal succession established to perpetuity.

2 Sam. vii. 16.

Ps. cxxxii. 11, 12.

But yet in a larger and better sense, after these intercisions, the throne of David was continued. When they had sinned, and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it; and he being of the seed of David, in him the throne of David was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the angel Gabriel speak at his conception, *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* Thus the throne of Christ is called the throne of David, because it was promised unto David, and because the kingdom of David was a type, resemblance, and representation of it; insomuch that Christ himself in respect of this kingdom is often called David, as particularly in that promise, *I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them.*

Luke i. 32, 33.

Jer. xxx. 9. Ez. xxxvii. 24, 25. Hos. iii. 5. Ez. xxxiv. 23, 24.

Now as David was not only first designed, but also anointed king over Israel, and yet had no possession of the crown; seven years he continued anointed by Samuel, and had no share in the dominion; seven years after he continued anointed in Hebron only king over the tribe of Judah; at last he was received by all the tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regal power over all Israel, and seated himself in the royal city of Jerusalem: so Christ was born King of the Jews, and the conjunction of his human nature with his Divine in the union of his person was a
281 sufficient unction to his regal office, yet as the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his *kingdom was not of this world;* but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in Hebron with his own tribe he tells the Apostles, *All power is given unto him;* and by virtue thereof gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the Jerusalem above, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could St. Peter say, *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*

1 Sam. xvi. 13.

2 Sam. ii. 4.

Acts ii. 36.

The immediate effect of this regal power, the proper execution of this office, is the subduing of all his enemies; for he is *set down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.* This was the ancient custom of the oriental conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when Joshua had the five kings as his prisoners, he *said unto the men of war which went with him, Come near, put your feet upon the necks of them.* Thus to signify the absolute and total conquest of Christ, and the dreadful majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lie down before him, and he to set his feet upon them.

Heb. x. 12, 13.

Josh. x. 24.

The enemies of Christ are of two kinds, either temporal or spiritual; the temporal enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his Apostles, and all those which profess to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the Jews, who rejected, persecuted, and crucified him; who after his resurrection scourged, stoned, and despitefully used his Disciples; who tried all ways and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his regal office was to subdue these enemies, [illegible] he sat down on the right hand of God, that they might be

made his footstool: which they suddenly were according to his prediction. *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.* For within few years the temple, the city, and the whole polity of the Jews were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the Romans, which they made use of to crucify the Lord of life. The Romans themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the Jews in Christ's crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of kings; and so they were when Rome, the regnant city, the head of that vast empire, was taken and sacked; when the Christians were preserved, and the heathens perished; when the worship of all their idols ceased, and the whole Roman empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and nations whatsoever, which openly oppose and persecute the name of Christ, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth, to be slain.

Matt. xvi. 28.

The spiritual enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to Christ's dominion, as sin, Satan, death. Every one of these hath a kingdom of its own, set up and opposed to the kingdom of Christ. The Apostle hath taught us, that *sin hath reigned unto death;* and hath commanded us not to *let it reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof.* There is therefore a dominion and kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have been like the Most High, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is *the prince of this world: the spirit, which now worketh in the children of disobedience,* is *the prince of the power of the air;* and thus *the rulers of the darkness of this world* oppose themselves to *the true light of the world.* Death also hath its dominion, and, as the Apostle speaks, *reigned from Adam to Moses;* even *by one offence death reigned by one,* and so set up a ruling and a regal power against *the Prince of life.*

Rom. v. 21. vi. 12. John xvi. 11. Eph. ii 2. vi. 12. Rom. v. 14. 17. Acts iii. 15.

For the destruction of these powers was Christ exalted to the right hand of God, and by his regal office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universal, but that sin, Satan, and death, shall still continue. It is true he shall *put down all rule and authority and power;* but

1 Cor. xv. 24.

amounts not so much to a total destruction, as to an absolute subjection: for as he is *able*, so will he *subdue all things unto himself*. The principal end of the regal office of the Mediator is the effectual redemption and actual salvation of all those whom God hath given him; and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these, is by that opposition constituted and become an enemy of Christ. And because this enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as any thing opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far it is an enemy, and no farther: and consequently Christ, by sitting at the right hand of God, hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spiritual enemies, so far as they make this opposition; and farther than they do oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindereth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdom, for the demonstration of God's mercy, is abolished: but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice, is continued. Phil. iii. 21

Christ then as King destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his kingdom, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habitual. But in the reprobate and damned souls, the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in its absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

Again, Christ sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of hell: by virtue of his death perpetually represented to his Father, *he destroyeth him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil.* But the actual destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference only to the elect of God. In them he preventeth the *wiles*, those he taketh out of the *snare;* in them he destroyeth the *works*, those he preserveth from *the condemnation of the Devil.* He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace; he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Heb. ii. 14. Eph. vi. 11. 2 Tim. ii. 26. 1 John iii. 8. 1 Tim. iii. 6.

angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the Divine justice.

Thirdly, Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth
1Cor.xv.26. death itself: for *the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death.* But this destruction reacheth no farther than removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by Christ into the full possession of his heavenly king-
Hos.xiii.14. dom. He *will ransom them from the power of the grave,* he *will redeem them from death. O death,* he *will be thy plague; O grave,* he *will be thy destruction.* The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be framed again out of the dust, and the souls which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return to life, 283
1Cor.xv.54. and *death* shall be *swallowed up in victory.* The sons of God shall then be made completely happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus
2Tim.i.10. he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light.* But to the reprobate and damned persons, death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a *second,* and a far worse *death.* And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of God, that he might subdue all things to himself.

The regal power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship,
1Cor.xv.25. is to continue till all those enemies be subdued. *For he must*
Heb. ii. 8. *reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. But now we see not yet all things put under him.* Therefore he must still continue there: and this necessity is grounded upon the promise of
Ps. cx. 1. the Father, and the expectation of the Son. *Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,* saith the Father; upon which words we may ground as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the Father, the Son
Heb. x. 12, 13. *sate down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.* Being then the promise of God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of Christ cannot be frustrated, it followeth, that our Mediator shall exercise the regal power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his kingdom,

when those which refused him to rule over them shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the prophetical part to instruct us, nor any act of the priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this regal power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defence and protection. As therefore the general notion of a Mediator ceaseth when all are made one, because *a Mediator is not a Mediator of one;* so every part or branch of that Mediatorship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts complete. *Then* cometh *the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.* For *when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

Gal. iii. 20.

1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

Now though the Mediatorship of Christ be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed; though the regal office as part of that Mediatorship be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a King, or lose any of the power and honour which before he had[61]. The dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered: and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us kings and priests, which honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall *reign with him* for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him King. *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever,* not only to the modificated eternity of his Mediatorship, so long as there shall be need of regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect; but also to the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is coeternal to his divinity.

2 Tim. ii. 12.

Rev. xi. 15.

284 Lest we should imagine that Christ should ever cease to be

61 'Videamus an traditio regni defectio sit intelligenda regnandi; ut quod tradit Filius Patri tradendo non teneat.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* xi. *cap.* 29. [p. 1099 C.]

King, or so interpret this Article, as if he were after the day of judgment to be removed from the right hand of God, the ancient Fathers added those words to the Nicene Creed, *whose kingdom shall have no end*[62], against the heresy which then arose, denying the eternity of the kingdom of Christ.

62 Οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. We find not these words in the Nicene Creed, as it was in itself before the additions at Constantinople. But not long after, St. Cyril expounds them in his Catechism; and Epiphanius *in Ancorato*, [vol. ii. pp. 121, 124.] repeating two several Creeds, a shorter and a longer, §. 120 and 121, hath these words in both. After this they were added expressly in the Constantinopolitan Creed: and the reason of their insertion, without question, was that which St. Cyril insinuateth in his explication, that is, the heresy which was then newly begun. Κἂν ποτέ τινος ἀκούσῃς λέγοντος, ὅτι τέλος ἔχει ἡ Χριστοῦ βασιλεία, μίσησον τὴν αἵρεσιν· τοῦ δράκοντός ἐστιν ἄλλη κεφαλή, προσφάτως περὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀναφυεῖσα. Ἐτόλμησέ τις λέγειν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ τέλος τοῦ κόσμου ὁ Χριστὸς οὐ βασιλεύει· καὶ ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Λόγος ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξελθών, οὗτος εἰς Πατέρα πάλιν ἀναλυθεὶς οὐκέτι ἐστί. *Catech.* 15. [§. 27. p. 239 C.] This was the particular heresy of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, followed by Photinus born in the same place, and therefore termed by St. Cyril περὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀναφυεῖσα. It consisted of two parts; first, that the kingdom of Christ did wholly cease at the end of this world; secondly, that the Word was resolved again into the Father, and consequently did not only cease to reign, but also cease to exist. Which is yet more plainly expressed by Eusebius in his second book against Marcellus; Καὶ πάλιν, τοῦτον ἀθρόως παυσθήσεσθαι μετὰ τὸν τῆς κρίσεως καιρὸν, τοῦ μὲν Λόγου ἑνωμένου τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς μηδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι πλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς, ἧς ἀνείληφεν, ἐρήμου καταλειφθησομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου, ὡς μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ποτε ὑφεστάναι, μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὃν ἀνείληφε. *Cap.* 1. [p. 32 C.] This heresy of Marcellus St. Basil properly calls an impiety εἰς τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· *Epist.* 78. [Epist. CXXV. 1. vol. iii. p. 215 B.] and again, εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὕπαρξιν τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεότητος· *Epist.* 52. which he there more fully expresseth, Ὃς [Μάρκελλος] Λόγον μὲν εἰρῆσθαι τὸν μονογενῆ δίδωσι, κατὰ χρείαν καὶ ἐπὶ καιροῦ προελθόντα, πάλιν δὲ εἰς τὸν ὅθεν ἐξῆλθεν ἐπαναστρέψαντα, οὔτε πρὸ τῆς ἐξόδου εἶναι, οὔτε μετὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον ὑφεστάναι. [Epist. LXIX. 2. p. 162 E.] This existence of the Word and the kingdom of the Son, that heresy made coeval; beginning when the Word came from the Father, that is, at the incarnation; and ending when the Word returned into the Father, that is, at the day of judgment. Which is manifestly delivered by the eastern bishops in that profession of faith which they sent to those in Italy: Ἀλλ' ἔκ τοτε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνείληφε, πρὸ τετρακοσίων ὅλων ἐτῶν. Ἔκ τοτε γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἐσχηκέναι θέλουσι, καὶ τέλος ἕξειν αὐτὴν, μετὰ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ κρίσιν. Τοιοῦτοι δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ, τῶν Ἀγκυρογαλατῶν· οἳ τὴν προαιώνιον ὕπαρξίν τε καὶ θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀτελεύτητον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ὁμοίως Ἰουδαίοις ἀθετοῦσιν, ἐπὶ προφάσει τοῦ συνίστασθαι δοκεῖν τὴν μοναρχίαν. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 19. [p. 100.] But although Marcellus did thus teach the kingdom of Christ not to be eternal, yet his heresy did not so much consist in the denial of this eternity, as of the subsistence and person of our Saviour: for otherwise he did truly teach that Christ was an eternal King; as appeareth out of his own words in his book against Asterius the Arian, cited by Eusebius; Οὐκοῦν ὅρον τινὰ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἡ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερον βούλεται, ἢ τοῦτο, τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ῥηθὲν, ἕως ἂν θῇ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὰν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σχῇ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν, οὐκ ἔτι χρῄζει τῆς ἐν μέρει ταύτης βασιλείας, πάντων καθόλου βασι-

The profession of faith in Christ, as sitting on the right hand of God, is necessary; first, to mind us of our duty, which must needs consist in subjection and obedience. The majesty of a king claimeth the loyalty of a subject; and if we acknowledge his authority, we must submit unto his power. Nor can there be a greater incitation to obedience, than the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be, whether we will or no; but if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom; if unwillingly, then is our averseness everlasting misery. Enemies we all have been; under his feet we all shall be, either adopted or subdued[63]. A double kingdom there is of Christ[64]; one of power, in which all are under him; another of propriety, in those which belong unto him: none of us can be excepted from the first; and happy are we, if by our obedience we shew ourselves to have an interest in the second; for then that kingdom is not only Christ's but ours.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe in Christ sitting on the right hand of God, that we might be assured of an auspicious protection under his gracious dominion. For God by his exaltation hath *given* our Saviour *to be the head over all things to the Church;* and therefore from him we may expect direction and preservation. There can be no illegality where Christ is the Lawgiver; there can be no danger from hostility where the Son
285 of God is the Defender. The very name of *Head* hath the signification not only of dominion but of union[65]; and therefore while we look upon him at the right hand of God, we see

Eph. i. 22.

λεὺς ὑπάρχων. *Cont. Marcel. lib.* ii. *cap.* 4. [p. 51 D.] And therefore he made the same confession with the Catholics, when he delivered an account of his faith to Julius bishop of Rome; Πιστεύω δὲ ἑπόμενος ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς, ὅτι εἷς Θεὸς, καὶ ὁ τούτου μονογενὴς Υἱὸς Λόγος, ὁ ἀεὶ συνυπάρχων τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ μηδεπώποτε ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι ἐσχηκὼς, ἀληθῶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐ κτισθεὶς, οὐ ποιηθεὶς, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ὢν, ἀεὶ συμβασιλεύων τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μαρτυρίαν, οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxxii. §. 2. [vol. i. p. 835 D.]

63 'Inimicus eras: eris sub pedibus ejus, aut adoptatus, aut victus.' *S. August. in Psal.* cix. [§. 9. vol. iv. p. 1234 D.]

64 Βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ δύο οἶδεν ἡ γραφὴ, τὴν μὲν κατ' οἰκείωσιν, τὴν δὲ κατὰ δημιουργίαν· βασιλεύει μὲν γὰρ ἁπάντων, καὶ Ἑλλήνων, καὶ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ δαιμόνων, καὶ τῶν ἀντιτεταγμένων, κατὰ τὸν τῆς δημιουργίας λόγον· βασιλεύει δὲ τῶν πιστῶν, καὶ ἑκόντων, καὶ ὑποτεταγμένων, κατὰ τὸν τῆς οἰκειώσεως. *S. Chrysost. Homil.* 39. *in* 1. *ad Corinth.* [§. 6. vol. x. p. 371 E.]

65 This is the exclamation of St. Chrysostom upon those words of St. Paul; βαβαὶ, ποῦ πάλιν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνήγαγεν; ὥσπερ διά τινος ἕλκων μηχανῆς, εἰς ὕψος αὐτὴν ἀνήγαγε μέγα, καὶ αὐτὴν ἐκάθισεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὸν θρόνον· ἔνθα γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ, ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ σῶμα· οὐδενὶ γὰρ μέσῳ διείργεται ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα· εἰ γὰρ διείργετο, οὐκ ἂν εἴη σῶμα, οὐκ ἂν εἴη κεφαλή. *Homil.* 3. *in Epist. ad Ephes.* [§. 2. vol. xi. p. 19 D.]

ourselves in heaven. This is the special promise which he hath
Rev. iii. 21. made us since he sate down there, *(To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne.)* How should we rejoice, yea rather how should we fear and tremble at so great an honour[66]!

Thirdly, The belief of Christ's glorious session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence, which is his most gracious intercession. Our Saviour is ascended as the true Mel-
Heb. vii. 1. chizedech, not only as the *King of Salem*, the Prince of Peace,
Heb. x. 11, 12. but also as the *Priest of the most high God;* and whereas *every priest*, according to the Law of Moses, *stood daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which could never take away sins, this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sate down on the right hand of God.* And now Christ being set down in that power and majesty, though the sacrifice be but once offered, yet the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by his session, which was founded on his passion: for he is
Heb. ix. 24. *entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God*
1 John ii. 1. *for us.* (Thus, *if any man sin, we have an advocate with the*
Heb. vii. 25. *Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*) And *he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.*) What then remaineth to all true believers, but that triumphant exclamation of the Apostle,
Rom. viii. 33, 34. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* For he which was accepted in his oblation, and therefore sate down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his intercession; and having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his postulations[67] at the throne of God.)

66 Ἐννόει τὸν θρόνον τὸν βασιλικὸν, ἐννόει τῆς τιμῆς τὴν ὑπερβολήν. τοῦτο καὶ γεέννης, εἴ γε βουλοίμεθα, μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς φοβῆσαι δυνήσεται. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ γέεννα ἦν, τὸ τιμηθέντας τοσαύτην τιμὴν ἀναξίους εὑρεθῆναι καὶ κακούς· τίνα οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι κόλασιν; τίνα τιμωρίαν; ἐννόησον τίνος ἐγγὺς ἡ κεφαλή σου κάθηται (τοῦτο μόνον καὶ ἀπόχρη πρὸς πᾶν ὁτιοῦν), τίνος ἐν δεξιᾷ ἵδρυται. *S. Chrysost. Homil. 3. in Epist. ad Ephes.* [ibid. §. 3. p. 20 F.]

67 St. Austin discoursing upon that place of St. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 1. *I exhort that, first of all, supplications, prayers,*

Having thus explicated the session of our Saviour, we are next to consider the description of him at whose right hand he is set down; which seems to be delivered in the same terms with which the Creed did first begin, *I believe in God the Father Almighty;* and indeed, as to the expression of his essence, it is the same name of *God;* as to the setting forth his relation, it is the same name of *Father;* but as to the adjoining attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *almighty.* What therefore we have spoken of the nature of
286 God, and the person of the Father, is not here to be repeated, but supposed; for Christ is set down at the right hand of that God and of that Father, which we understand when we say, *I believe in God the Father.* But because there is a difference in the language of the Greeks between that word which is rendered *almighty*[68] in the first Article, and that which is so

and intercessions be made for all men, observeth what is the nature of intercession: 'Pro *interpellationibus* autem quod nostri habent, secundum codices, credo, vestros, *postulationes* posuisti. Hæc interim duo, id est, quod alii *postulationes,* alii *interpellationes* interpretati sunt, unum verbum transferre voluerunt, quod Græcus habet, *ἐντεύξεις.* Et profecto advertis, et nosti aliud esse interpellare, aliud postulare. Non enim solemus dicere, postulant interpellaturi, sed interpellant postulaturi: veruntamen ex vicinitate verbum usurpatum, cui propinquitas ipsa impetrat intellectum, non est velut censoria notatione culpandum. Nam et de ipso Domino Jesu Christo dictum est, quod interpellat pro nobis. Numquid nam interpellat, et non etiam postulat? Imo vero quia postulat, pro eo positum est, *interpellat.* Evidenter quippe alibi de eo dicitur, *Et si quis peccaverit, advocatum habemus apud Patrem, Jesum Christum justum, et ipse est exoratio pro peccatis nostris.* Quanquam fortassis codices apud vos etiam in eo loco de Domino Jesu Christo non habent, *interpellat pro nobis,* sed *postulat pro nobis.* In Græco enim, quo verbo hic positæ sunt *interpellationes,* quas ipse posuisti *postulationes,* ipsum et illic verbum est, ubi scriptum est, *interpellat pro nobis.* Cum igitur et qui precatur oret, et qui orat precetur, et qui interpellat Deum, ad hoc interpellet, ut oret et precetur,' &c. *Epist.* lix. *ad Paulinum, Quæst.* 5. *cap.* 2. [Epist. CXLIX. 14. vol. ii. p. 508 F.]

[68] In the first Article it is Παντοκράτωρ, in the sixth Παντοδύναμος. See above, page 82.* And this distinction is very material, and much observed by the Greeks; as Dionysius Areopagita (whosoever that is) in his book *De Divinis Nominibus,* in the 8th chapter, explicates the δυναμωνυμίαν, or παντοδύναμον, and in the 10th chapter παντοκράτωρ, as two distinct names with different notions of God. Of the Παντοκράτωρ, which we have already considered, he gives this account [p. 254 B.]; Τὸ μὲν γὰρ λέγεται, διὰ τὸ πάντων αὐτὸν εἶναι παντοκρατορικὴν ἕδραν, συνέχουσαν καὶ περιέχουσαν τὰ ὅλα, καὶ ἐνιδρύουσαν, καὶ θεμελιοῦσαν καὶ περισφίγγουσαν, καὶ ἀρραγὲς ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸ πᾶν ἀποτελοῦσαν, καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς τὰ ὅλα, καθάπερ ἐκ ῥίζης παντοκρατορικῆς, προάγουσαν, καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὴν τὰ πάντα καθάπερ εἰς πυθμένα παντοκρατορικὸν ἐπιστρέφουσαν, καὶ συνέχουσαν αὐτὰ, ὡς πάντων ἕδραν παγκρατῆ, τὰ συνεχόμενα πάντα κατὰ μίαν ὑπερ-

* [There is reason to think that Pearson was mistaken in making this remark. In several copies of the Greek creed, the word παντοκράτωρ is used in both clauses. See Notes on some peculiar texts by J. Hallet, p. 105. vol. i.]

rendered in the sixth; because that peculiarly signifieth authority of dominion, this more properly power in operation; therefore we have reserved this notion of omnipotency now to be explained.

In which, two things are observable; the propriety, and the universality; the propriety in the potency, the universality in the omnipotency; first, that he is a God of power; secondly, that he is a God of infinite power. The potency consisteth in a proper, innate, and natural force or activity, by which we are assured that God is able to act, work, and produce true and real effects, which do require a true and real power to their production: and in respect of this he is often described unto us under the notion of a *mighty* God. The omnipotency or infinity of this power consisteth in an ability to act, perform, and produce, whatsoever can be acted or produced, without any possibility of impediment or resistance: and in this respect he is represented to us as an *almighty* God. And therefore such an omnipotency we ascribe unto him: which is sufficiently deli-
Luke i. 37. vered in the Scriptures, first by the testimony of an angel, *For with God nothing shall be impossible;* secondly, by the testimony
Mark x. 27. of Christ himself, who said, *With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible.* Now he, to whom all things are possible, and to whom nothing is impossible, is truly and properly omnipotent. Thus whatsoever doth not in itself imply a repugnancy of being or subsisting, hath in reference to the power of God a possibility of production; and whatsoever in respect of the power of God hath an impossibility of production, must involve in itself a repugnancy or contradiction.

This truth, though confessed by the Heathens, hath yet been denied by some of them; but with such poor and insufficient arguments[69], that we shall need no more than an explication of the doctrine to refute their objections.

ἔχουσαν πάντα συνοχὴν ἀσφαλιζομένην, καὶ οὐκ ἐῶσαν αὐτὰ διεκπεσόντα ἑαυτῆς, ὡς ἐκ παντελοῦς ἑστίας κινούμενα παραπολέσθαι. But of the δυναμωνυμία he gives another account, as we shall see hereafter.

69 The arguments which the Heathen used are briefly touched by Plutarch, but were more largely delivered by Pliny. Ἀνηρήσθω γὰρ (φησὶν) ὁ ποιητικὸς λῆρος, σὺν Καλλιμάχῳ τῷ λέγοντι,

——Εἰ Θεὸν οἶσθα,

Ἴσθ' ὅτι καὶ ῥέξαι δαίμονι πᾶν δυνατόν.

(so it must be read) οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς δύναται πᾶν ποιεῖν. Ἐπεί τοιγε, εἰ Θεός ἐστι, ποιείτω τὴν χιόνα μέλαιναν, τὸ δὲ πῦρ ψυχρὸν, τὸ δὲ καθήμενον ὀρθὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον. *Plutarch. de Plac. Philosoph. lib.* i. *cap.* 7. 'Imperfectæ vero in homine naturæ præcipua solatia, ne Deum

First, then, we must say God is omnipotent, because all power whatsoever is in any creature is derived from him; and well may he be termed *Almighty*, who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any agent, no influence of any cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from the principal
287 Agent, or the first of causes. There is nothing in the whole circumference of the universe, but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act[70]; (for nothing can be done without a power to do it:) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their several and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite Essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite Power.

Secondly, God may be called omnipotent, because there can be no resistance made to his power[71], no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. *The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?* According to the degrees of power in the agent and the resistant, is an action performed or hindered: if there be more degrees of power in the resistant than the agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, but not wholly hindered or suppressed. But if there be no degree of power in the resistant in reference to the agent, then is the action totally vigorous;

Isa. xiv. 27.

Dan. iv. 35.

quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem consciscere, si velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ pœnis: nec mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos: nec facere, ut qui vixit, non vixerit; qui honores gessit, non gesserit; nullumque habere in præterita jus, præterquam oblivionis: atque (ut facetis quoque argumentis societas hæc cum Deo copuletur) ut bis dena viginti non sint, ac multa similiter efficere non posse, per quæ declaratur haud dubie naturæ potentia, idque esse, quod Deum vocamus.' *Plin. Nat. Hist. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [c. 5.] Add unto these that objection of Elymas the sorcerer, recorded by Dionysius: Καίτοι φησὶν Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος, Εἰ παντοδύναμός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς, πῶς λέγεταί τι μὴ δύνασθαι πρὸς [illegible] καθ' ὑμᾶς θεολόγου; Λοιδορεῖται δὲ τῷ θείῳ Παύλῳ φήσαντι, μὴ δύνασθαι τὸν Θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀρνήσασθαι. *De Divin. Nom. cap.* 8. [p. 243 B.]

70 Ἡ ἀπειροδύναμος τοῦ Θεοῦ διάδοσις εἰς πάντα τὰ ὄντα χωρεῖ, καὶ οὐδέν ἐστι τῶν ὄντων ὃ παντελῶς ἀφῄρηται τὸ ἔχειν τινὰ δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἢ νοερὰν, ἢ λογικὴν, ἢ αἰσθητικὴν, ἢ ζωτικὴν, ἢ οὐσιώδη δύναμιν ἔχει· καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, τὸ εἶναι δύναμιν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἔχει παρὰ τῆς ὑπερουσίου δυνάμεως. *Dionys. Areopag. De Divin. Nom. cap.* 8. [p. 241 C.]

71 'Neque enim ob aliud veraciter vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quoniam quidquid vult potest, nec voluntate cujuspiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus.' *S. August. Enchir. ad Laur. de Fide,* &c. *cap.* 96. [§. 24. vol. vi. p. 231 G.]

and if in all the powers, beside that of God, there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his, being above all opposition, to be infinite. As Jehosaphat said, *In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?* From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any thing; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest than the least of creatures; but an equal facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be imagined but by an infinite excess of power above and beyond all resistance[72].

2 Chron. xx. 6.

Thirdly, God is yet more properly called omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth itself to all things[73]; neither is there any thing imaginably possible which he cannot do. Thus when God several ways had declared his power unto Job, *Job answered the Lord, and said, I know that thou canst do every thing.* Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively, in respect of its object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced; intensively, in respect of the action, or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible, is within the sphere of God's omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in itself such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is, which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time, and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power: and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

Job xlii. 1, 2.

72 'Nisi omnipotens esset, non una eademque facilitate summa atque ima fecisset.' *Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, cap.* 3. [§. 25. p. 511.]

73 'Quis est omnipotens, nisi qui omnia potest?' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 20. [§. 27. vol. viii. p. 828 B.]

Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either
288 in respect of the object, or in respect of the agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction immediately or consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in terms doth signify a repugnancy, and so destroys itself, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God to make that not to have been, which hath already been[74]: but that is no derogation to God's power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence, if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in itself; which is, that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequential contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

That doth imply a contradiction in respect of the agent, which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for being every action floweth from the essence of the agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence must involve a contradiction as to the agent. Thus we may say, God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot die[75]; he cannot sleep, whose being is spiritual;

74 Τὸ γεγονὸς οὐκ ἐνδέχεται μὴ γενέσθαι· διὸ ὀρθῶς Ἀγάθων,

Μόνου γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεὸς στερίσκεται,
Ἀγένητα ποιεῖν ἅσσ' ἂν ἢ πεπραγμένα.

Arist. Ethic. Eudem. lib. v. *cap.* 2. 'Quisquis dicit, Si omnipotens est Deus, faciat ut quæ facta sunt, facta non fuerint; non videt hoc se dicere, Si omnipotens est, faciat ut ea quæ vera sunt, eo ipso quo vera sunt falsa sint.' *S. August. cont. Faust. lib.* xxvi. *cap.* 5. [vol. viii. p. 436 D.] It is granted therefore to be true, which Pliny objects, 'Deum non facere ut qui vixit, non vixerit; qui honores gessit, non gesserit;' *Nat. Hist. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [c. 5.] but this proves nothing against omnipotency because it is no act of possibility. Had the act objected been feasible, and God had not the power to effect it, then had he wanted some power, and consequently had not been omnipotent. But being it is not want of power in the agent, but of possibility in the object, it proveth no deficiency in God.

75 'Neque enim et vitam Dei et præscientiam Dei sub necessitate ponimus, si dicamus necesse esse Deum semper vivere, et cuncta præscire: sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori fallique non posse. Sic enim hoc non potest, ut potius, si posset, minoris esset utique potestatis. Recte quippe omnipotens dicitur, qui tamen mori et

he cannot want, whose nature is all-sufficient; he cannot die, who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity.

Heb. vi. 18. Thus it is *impossible for God to lie*[76], to whom we say nothing
2 Tim. ii. 13. is impossible; and he, who can do all things, *cannot deny him-* 289
self[77]. Because a lie is repugnant to the perfection of veracity, which is essential unto God, as necessarily following from his infinite knowledge and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are sinful may deceive; but it is

falli non potest. Dicitur enim omnipotens faciendo quod vult, non patiendo quod non vult: quod ei si accideret, nequaquam esset omnipotens. Unde propterea quædam non potest, quia omnipotens est.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* v. *cap.* 10. [vol. vii. p. 125 A.] 'Nam ego dico quanta non possit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest: quæ si posset, non esset omnipotens.' *Auctor Serm.* cxix. *de Temp. cap.* 1. [Augustin. Op. vol. v. p. 939 B. Epist. CCXIII.]

76 'Numquidnam mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur, quia *impossibile est mentiri Deum.* Impossibile autem istud, numquidnam infirmitatis est? Non utique. Nam quomodo omnia potest, si aliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossibile? Illud utique quod naturæ ejus contrarium est, non quod virtuti arduum. *Impossibile,* inquit, *est ei mentiri;* et impossibile istud non infirmitatis est, sed virtutis et majestatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorem.' *S. Ambros. Annot. in Num.* [Epist. 50. §. 1. vol. ii. p. 993 B.] 'Si volunt invenire quod Omnipotens non potest, habent prorsus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest. Credamus ergo quod potest, non credendo quod non potest.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xxii. *cap.* 25. [vol. vii. p. 693 A.]

77 This was the argument of Elymas the sorcerer before mentioned, to which Dionysius gives this answer; Ἡ ἑαυτοῦ ἄρνησις ἔκπτωσις ἀληθείας ἐστίν· ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἐστι, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας ἔκπτωσις τοῦ ὄντος ἔκπτωσις. Εἰ τοίνυν ἡ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ ἄρνησις τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ ὄντος ἔκπτωσις, ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος ἐκπεσεῖν ὁ Θεὸς οὐ δύναται, καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι οὐκ ἔστιν· ὡς ἄν τις φαίη, τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι οὐ δύναται, καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι κατὰ στέρησιν οὐκ οἶδεν. *De Divin. Nom. cap.* 8. [p. 243 C.] Φαμὲν δὲ καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύναται αἰσχρὰ ὁ Θεὸς, ἐπεὶ ἔσται ὁ Θεὸς δυνάμενος μὴ εἶναι Θεός· εἰ γὰρ αἰσχρόν τι δρᾷ ὁ Θεὸς, οὐκ ἔστι Θεός. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib.* v. [c. 23. p. 595 A.] Jobius gives this solution to the same objection: Ἃ φαμὲν μὴ δύνασθαι τὸ θεῖον, ταῦτα τῶν μήτε ὄντων ἐστὶ, μήτε δυνατῶν ὅλως ὑφεστάναι· ποῦ γὰρ ὑφέστηκε τὸ ἀρνήσασθαι τὸν Θεὸν ἑαυτὸν, ἢ ἡ τροπὴ, ἢ ἡ τῆς ἀγαθότητος ἔκπτωσις, ἢ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ψεῦδος γενέσθαι; Παντοδύναμος δὲ ὑμνεῖται καὶ λέγεται, ὡς τά τε πρέποντα αὐτῷ καὶ σωτήρια τῶν δημιουργημάτων πάντα δυνάμενος, ὅτε βούλεται. *Job. de Verb. Incarn. lib.* iii. *cap.* 13. *apud Phot. in Biblioth.* [222.] Ὁ Ἀπόστολός φησι περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, Ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεόν· οὐκ ἀσθένειάν τινα κατηγορῶν τῆς παγκρατοῦς δυνάμεως, ἀλλὰ μεγίστην ῥώμην, ὅτι ἀνεπίδεκτός ἐστι τοῦ ψεύδους ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας πατήρ· καὶ ἀλλαχόσε δὲ ταύτην ὀχυρῶν τὴν ἔννοιαν ἔφη· Ἐὰν ἀρνησώμεθα [αὐτὸν] ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται. Καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἀσθενείας ἐστὶν ἀπόδειξις, ἀλλ' ἀνυπερβλήτου ἰσχύος, ὅτι οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἑαυτὴν ἀρνήσασθαι. *Isidor. Pelus. Epist.* 335. *lib.* iii. [p. 387 A.] Theodoret upon that place of St Paul, *It is impossible for God to lie,* Οὐκ ἀσθενὲς τὸ ἀδύνατον, ἀλλὰ ἄγαν αὐτὸ δεικνὺς δυνατόν. Οὕτω γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς, ὡς ἀδύνατον εἶναι ψεῦδος ἐν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι ποτέ. Τὸ δυνατὸν ἄρα (*ita lege, non* ἀδύνατον οὖν) τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου σημαίνεται. [vol. iv. p. 123 D.] And upon that, *He cannot deny himself,* Πάλιν οὖν τὸ οὐ δύναται τῆς ἀπείρου δυνάμεως ὑπάρχει δηλώτικον, &c. *Dial.* 3. [p. 124 A.]

repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive, which is no way capable of sin. For as it is a plain contradiction to know all things, and to be ignorant of any thing; so is it to know all things, and to be deceived: as it is an evident contradiction to be infinitely holy, and to be sinful, so is it to be infinitely holy, and deceive. But it is impossible for any one to lie, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifest contradiction to say that God can lie, and consequently it is no derogation from his omnipotency, that he cannot. Whatsoever then God cannot do, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but only shew that the rest of his attributes and perfections are as essential to him as his power; and as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well therefore may we conclude him absolutely omnipotent, who by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections, sheweth infinite ability; and by not being able to do any thing repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrateth himself subject to no infirmity or imbecility[78]. And in this manner we maintain God's omnipotency, with the best and eldest, against the worst and latest of the heathen authors[79].

[78] Theodoret having proved that there were many things which fell not under the power of God, at last thus concludes: Πολλὰ τοίνυν εὑρήκαμεν ἀδύνατα ὄντα τῷ παντοδυνάμῳ Θεῷ.—Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυνηθῆναί τι τούτων, ἀπείρου δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἀσθενείας τεκμήριον· τὸ δέ γε δυνηθῆναι, ἀδυναμίας δήπουθεν, οὐ δυνάμεως.—Ὅτι τούτων ἕκαστον τὸ ἄτρεπτον τοῦ Θεοῦ κηρύττει καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον. *Dial.* 3. [p. 123 B.] And Origen, *cont. Cels. lib.* iii. [c. 70. vol. i. p. 493 F.] gives this for the Christian's general rule: Δύναται καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς, ἅπερ δυνάμενος, τοῦ Θεὸς εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, καὶ σοφὸς εἶναι οὐκ ἐξίσταται. And the words of Celsus, though ill intended, are yet very true: Αὐτὸς γὰρ [ὁ Θεὸς] ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων τῶν ὄντων λόγος, οὐδὲν οὗ οἷός τε παρὰ λόγον οὐδὲ παρ' ἑαυτὸν ἐργάσασθαι· [c. 14. p. 588 B.] and so Origen in his answer confesses: Ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν οἷός τε παράλογον οὔτε παρ' ἑαυτὸν ἐργάσασθαί ἐστιν ὁ Θεός. *Cont. Cels. lib.* v. [c 24. p. 596 A.]

[79] It was the constant opinion of the most ancient Heathens, as appeareth by Homer, who expresseth it plainly;

——————Χαλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀρύσσειν
Ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι· θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύνανται. Ὀδ. κ'. 305.

And the same sense is attributed to Linus in a distich cited for his by Stobæus; but may rather be thought to have been made by some of the Pythagoreans. For this was the plain doctrine of Pythagoras, who taught his scholars to believe miracles, and to doubt of nothing said to be done by the gods, because all things were possible to them; Οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τὰ μὲν δυνατὰ τῶν θεῶν, (*vel potius* τοῖς θεοῖς) τὰ δὲ ἀδύνατα, ὥσπερ οἴεσθαι τοὺς σοφιζομένους· ἀλλὰ πάντα δυνατά· καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι τῶν ἐπῶν, ἃ ἐκεῖνοι φασὶ μὲν εἶναι Λίνου, ἐστὶ μέντοι ἴσως ἐκείνων·

Ἔλπεσθαι χρὴ πάντ', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲν ἄελπτον·
Ῥᾴδ.α πάντα Θεῷ τελέσαι, καὶ ἀνήνυτον οὐδέν.

Iamb. de Vit. Pythag. cap. 28.

So Epicharmus, a disciple of Pytha-

Thus God is omnipotent, and God only. For if the power of all things beside God be the power of God, as derived from him, and subordinate unto him, and his own power from whence that is derived can be subordinate to none, then none can be omnipotent but God.

Again, we say, that *God the Father* is *Almighty;* but then we cannot say, that the Father only is Almighty: for the reason why we say the Father is Almighty, is because he is God; and therefore we cannot say that he only[80] is Almighty, because it is not true that he only is God. Whosoever then is God, hath 290
the same reason and foundation of omnipotency which the Father hath, and consequently is to be acknowledged properly and truly omnipotent as the Father is. But we have already shewed that the Son of God is truly God; and shall hereafter shew that the Holy Ghost is also God, and that by the same nature by which the Father is God. The *Father* therefore is *Almighty,* because the Father is God; *the Son Almighty,* because the Son is God; and *the Holy Ghost Almighty,* because the Holy Ghost is God. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God by the same Divinity: therefore, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are omnipotent by the same Omnipotency. The Father then is not called *Almighty* by way of exclusion, but is here mentioned with that attribute peculiarly, because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, as being *the right hand of power*[81]. The

goras: Ἀδύνατον οὐδὲν Θεῷ. So *Pater Omnipotens,* and *Jupiter Omnipotens,* familiar to Virgil and the poets before and after him. These do far overweigh the authority in Plutarch, and that of Pliny, with the addition of Galen, who opposeth the opinion of the philosophers to that of Moses expressly, and to our Saviour obliquely; Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸ βουληθῆναι τοιαύτας γενέσθαι μόνον ἦν αὔταρκες· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ τὴν πέτραν ἐξαίφνης ἐθελήσειεν ἄνθρωπον ποιῆσαι, δυνατὸν αὐτῷ. Which seems to be opposed to those words of our Saviour's, *God is able to raise children unto Abraham out of these stones.* Καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι, καθ' ὃ τῆς Μωσέως δόξης ἥθ' ἡμετέρα καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἡ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησιν ὀρθῶς μεταχειρισαμένων τοὺς περὶ φύσεως λόγους διαφέρει. Τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀρκεῖ, τὸ βουληθῆναι τὸν Θεὸν κοσμῆσαι τὴν ὕλην, ἡ δ' εὐθὺς κεκόσμηται· πάντα γὰρ εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ δυνατὰ νομίζει, κἂν εἰ τὴν τέφραν ἵππον ἢ βοῦν ἐθέλει ποιεῖν· ἡμεῖς δ' οὐχ οὕτω γινώσκομεν, ἀλλ' εἶναί γάρ τινα λέγομεν ἀδύνατα φύσει, καὶ τούτοις μηδ' ἐπιχειρεῖν ὅλως τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν γενέσθαι τὸ βέλτιον αἱρεῖσθαι. *De Usu Part. lib.* xi. *cap.* 14. [vol. iv. p. 576 D.]

[80] 'Non ergo quispiam audebit quamlibet creaturam sive cœlestem sive terrestrem dicere omnipotentem, nisi solam Trinitatem, Patrem scilicet et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Non enim, cum dicimus nos *credere in Deum Patrem omnipotentem,* sicut hæretici Ariani, negamus Filium omnipotentem, aut Spiritum Sanctum.' *Auctor lib.* ii. *de Symb. ad Catechum. cap.* 3. [Augustin. Op. vol. vi. p. 558 D.]

[81] Nor is it unusual in other authors to make use of the word *omnipotens,* rather in relation to the present occasion, than in reference to the person

Father therefore is here described by the notion of *Almighty*, to shew that Christ having ascended into heaven, and being set down at *the right hand of God*, is invested with a greater power than he exercised before: and that power which was then actually conferred upon him, acknowledgeth no bounds or limits; but *all power* in the ultimate extent of its infinity is *given unto* him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is *God the Father;* and, being so, is therefore truly and properly *Almighty*.

It is necessary to profess belief in God *Almighty;* first, because the acknowledgment of his omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission and obedience, which is due unto his infinite majesty. Our God is *a great God, a mighty, and a terrible;* therefore terrible, because mighty. *I will forewarn you,* saith our Saviour, *whom ye shall fear: fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* Three times we are commanded to fear, and one only reason rendered, but sufficient for a thousand fears, the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerful persuasion to obedience, when he said unto him, *I am the Almighty God, walk before me, and be thou perfect.* It was a rational advice which the Apostle giveth us; *Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.* And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the law of God, to consider that he is the *one Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy.*

Deut. x. 17. Luke xii. 5. Gen. xvii. 1. 1 Pet. v. 6. Jam. iv. 12.

Secondly, The belief of God's omnipotency is absolutely necessary, as the foundation of our faith. All the miracles, which have been seen, were therefore wrought, that we might believe; and never miracle had been seen, if God were not omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all natural and finite power; and did they not require an infinite activity, an assent unto them would not deserve the name of faith. If God were not Almighty, we should believe nothing; but being he is so, why

who is said to be omnipotent; as is observed by Servius upon that verse of Virgil;

Jupiter omnipotens, audacibus annue cœptis. Æneid. ix. 625.

'Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur, interdum ad causam dicentis. Namque hoc loco dicendo *omnipotens*, ostendit eum etiam his, qui per se minus valent, præstare posse virtutem.'

should we disbelieve any thing[82]? what can God propound unto us, which we cannot assent unto, if we can believe that he is omnipotent?

Thirdly, It is not only necessary in matters of bare faith, and 297
notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative
Rom. iv. 20, 21. reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the father of the faithful, *who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform.* The promises of God are therefore firm and sure[83], because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to do what they have promised, or cannot do what they intend: in the first, we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us: therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can
2 Tim. i. 12. have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle, *I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.* I am assured that if I be a sheep, and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of dark-
John x. 29. ness and the gates of hell can never prevail against me; for it was the voice of the Son of God, *My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.*

Lastly, The belief of God's omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as, if God himself were not Almighty, he could not effect. And therefore,

82 This was the argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous; because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the divine power: and the reason of that was, because they thought all things possible to God, as we shewed before. Τῶν τοιούτων δὲ (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions, either fabulous or miraculous) τῶν δοκούντων μυθικῶν ἀπομνημονεύουσιν, ὡς μηδὲν ἀπιστοῦντες ὅ τι ἂν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀνάγηται. And whereas others looked upon them as weak and simple people for giving credit to such fabulous relations, πρὸς πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐχὶ αὐτοὺς εὐήθεις νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀπιστοῦντας. *Iamb. de Vit. Pythag. cap.* 28.

83 'In Dei promissis nulla est falsitas, quia in faciendis nulla omnipotenti est difficultas.' *Fulgent ad Monim. lib.* i. *cap.* 12. [p. 10.]

in that form of prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgment, *For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory.* Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, than that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, *who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.* Matt. vi. 13. Eph. iii. 20.

After this explication of our Saviour's session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be supposed, to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that Christ *is set on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much: I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his office of Mediator, unto the end of the world; according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity: which hand of God, the Father Almighty, signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe *in Jesus Christ* who *sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.*

392

ARTICLE VII.

From thence[84] *shall He come to judge the quick and the dead.*

THIS Article containeth in it four particular considerations, and no more: First, That Christ, who is gone from us, *shall come* again. Secondly, That the place from whence he shall then come, is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended,

84 Or *from whence;* the Latins sometimes *inde,* sometimes *unde.* And the Greek is ὅθεν, *unde,* both in the ancient MS. in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But ἐκεῖθεν ἐρχόμενον, in the later MS. in Bennet College Library. Others neither ὅθεν, nor ἐκεῖθεν, but πάλιν, as Justin Martyr; Ἡμεῖς ἐπέγνωμεν Χριστὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ σταυρωθέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα, καὶ ἀνεληλυθότα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ πάλιν παραγενησόμενον κριτὴν πάντων ἁπλῶς ἀνθρώπων μέχρις αὐτοῦ Ἀδάμ. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 132. [p. 224 E.] Others without *inde* or *unde,* only *venturus,* as the Nicene Creed, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι, others πάλιν ἐρχόμενον or ἥξοντα πάλιν, and Fortunatus leaving out *inde venturus,* hath only *judicaturus vivos et mortuos.*

for *from thence he shall come.* Thirdly, That the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is *to judge;* for *from thence he shall come to judge.* Fourthly, That the object of that action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whether dead before, or then alive; for *from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead.*

For the illustration of the first particular, two things will be necessary, and no more: first, to shew that the promised Messias was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already proved once to have come as the true Messias) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the Messias was to come again, was not only certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we were admonished of his coming to suffer; as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy, with the Jews, a double Messias, one the son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah: but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error; that the Messias is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and die, as they conceive of their son of Joseph; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they
Jude 14. expect the Son of David. Particularly, *Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied* of this advent, *saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his angels.* And more particularly Daniel
Dan. vii. 13, 14. saw the representation of his judiciary power and glory; *I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* This Son of man the Jews themselves confess to be the promised Messias[85], and they take the 29

85 R. Saadias Gaon *ad locum;* זהו משיח צדקנו—כדכתיב נאם יי׳ לאדני שב לימיני. In *Bereshith Rabba,* speaking of the genealogy concluding (1 Chron. iii. 24.) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Elioenai, the author asks this question, ומי הוא ענני *and who is this Anani?* and answers it thus, זה משיח שנ׳ חזה הויתי בחזוי ליליא וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא: *This is the Messias, as it is written,* Dan. vii. 13. *I saw in the*

words to signify his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth; but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying, that if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messias should come in humility[86], according to the description in Zachary, *lowly and riding upon an ass;* but if they pleased God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the Prophet Daniel, *with the clouds of heaven:* whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfilled. From whence it followeth, that, being Christ is already come *lowly and sitting upon an ass,* therefore hereafter he shall come gloriously *with the clouds of heaven.* For if both those descriptions cannot belong to one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally prophetical; then must there be a double advent of the same Messias, and so his second coming was foretold. Zech. ix. 9.

That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true Messias, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the angels, *This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* Acts i. 11.

night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with Anani, that is, *the clouds of heaven;** Solomon Jarchi *ad locum,* כבר אנש אתה הוא מלך המשיח and Aben Ezra *ibidem,* אמר רב ישועה כי זה כבר אנש הוא המשיח ונכון דבר. So the author of *Tzeror Hammor,* וסוד אדם הוא סוד משיח כאומרו כבר אנש אתי: *The mystery of man is the mystery of the Messias,* according to that of Daniel, *He came as the Son of man.*† This place is mentioned for one of the נחובין which speak of the Messias, in the *Midrash Tillim,* Psal. ii. And the *Midrash* upon the 21st Psalm, ver. 7. א' ר' ברכיה בשם ר' שמואל כתוב אחד אומ' וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש: speaking of the Messias. Indeed the Jews do so generally interpret this place of Daniel of the Messias, that they make it an argument to prove that the Messias is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven.

86 This interpretation is delivered in *libro Sanhedrim,* f. 98, c. 1; א' ר' אלכסנדרי ר' יהושע רמי כתיב על מלך המשיח וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא וכתיב עליו עני ורוכב על־חמור זכו עם־ענני שמיא לא זכו עני ורוכב על־חמור: *Idem etiam legitur in Bereshith Rabba R. Moseh Haddarshan,* Gen. xlix. 11. [Mart. Pug. Fid. 656.] Thus they make the coming of Christ to depend upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messias are absolute and irrespective, depending only on the goodness of God, not to be evacuated or altered by the wickedness of man. Nay, the unworthiness of the Jews, which Christ found, when he came in humility, is one special cause why he should come again in glory.

* [Taken from Mart. Pug. Fid. p. 331, being part of the extract quoted above in Art. IV. upon Zech. xii. 10. It is not in the Bereshith, but in the Jalkut, §. תקצא.—R. P. S.]

† [The author of the Tzeror Hammor was Abraham Saba. The passage may be found in f. ד col. 1. l. 8. of the Venice edition of 1523.—R. P. S.]

John xiv. 3, 28. We have the promise of Christ himself to his Apostles; *If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself: Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you.* He it is which from the beginning was Gen. xlix. 10. to *come;* that express prophecy so represented him, *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come;* the name of Shiloh was obscure, but the notion of the *Comer*, added to it, was most vulgar. According to this notion, once Christ came; and being gone, he keeps that notion still; he is to come again: Heb. x. 37. *For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come*[87]. Our Jesus then *shall come;* and not only so, but *shall* so *come*, as the Messias was foretold, after the same manner, in the same Matt. xvi. 28. glory of the Father, as *the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.* This was expressed in the prophetical vision by coming *with clouds*, and in the same manner shall our Jesus come; For Rev. i. 7. *behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.* Those clouds were anciently expounded by the Jews of the glorious attendance of the angels[88], waiting upon the Son of man: and in the same manner, with the same attendance, do we expect the coming of our Jesus,

[87] Heb. x. 37. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, that is, he who is known by that vulgar appellation ὁ ἐρχόμενος, he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore will come again. This was it which made the Apostles ask that question, Matt. xxiv. 3. *When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of* thy coming, *and of the end of the world?*

[88] As R. Saadias Gaon upon that place of Dan. vii. 13. עם־ענני השמים הם מלאכי צבא השמים וז היא רוב הגדולה שיתן הבורא למשיח: *The clouds of heaven, they are the angels of the host of heaven; this is the great magnificence and power which God shall give unto the Messias.* From hence is that exposition in *Midrash Tillim*, Psal. xxi. 7. א' ר' ברכיה בשם ר' שמואל כהוב אחד אומ' וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא וקדמוהי הקרבוהי וכתוב אחד אומר והקרבתיו ונגש אלי הא כיצד המלאכין מכניסין אותו עד מהיצתן: *Rabbi Barachia said in the name of Rabbi Samuel, One Scripture saith,* (Dan. vii. 13.) *And behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And another Scripture saith,* (Jer. xxx. 21.) *And I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me. Behold in what manner? The angels shall bring him into the midst of them.**

* [Martin. Pug. Fid. p. 504. quotes this passage in the same words as Bp. Pearson; but in the editio princeps of the Midrash Tillim, printed at Constantinople 1512, and in that of Venice 1546, instead of וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא are the words ועד עתיק יומיא מטא, "and he came to the Ancient of days, and they," &c.; omitting the mention of the Son of man. In the quotation from Jeremiah, both also read אותן for אותו, "the angels shall bring *them*," &c.; but the Jalkut on the Psalms (Livorno 1660) corrects this reading, as the sense requires, but agrees with the Midrash Tillim in the rest of the passage.—R. P. S.]

even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels.* Matt. xvi. 27. And thus our Jesus as the true Messias *shall come* again, which was our first consideration.

The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the Creed by reflection upon the
294 place whither he went when he departed from us; for *he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God,* and *from thence shall he come:* that is, from, and out of the highest heaven (where he now sitteth at the right hand of God) shall Christ hereafter come to judge both the quick and the dead. For *him must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things;* and when that time is fulfilled, from that heaven shall he come. *For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.* Acts iii. 21. 1 Thess. iv. 16. *Our conversation* ought to be *in heaven,* because from thence *we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus.* Phil. iii. 20. Our High Priest is gone up into the holy of holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us; therefore, as the people of Israel stood without the tabernacle, expecting the return of Aaron; so must we look unto the heavens, and expect Christ from thence, *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels.* 2 Thess. i. 7. We do believe that Christ is set down on the right hand of God; but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there; and to that purpose Christ himself hath joined them together, saying, *Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* Matt. xxvi. 64. Thus shall the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of power, in fulness of majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity; that by an undoubted authority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most fit *to judge both the quick and the dead:* which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging; *From whence shall he come to judge.*

For the explication of this action, as it stands in this Article, three considerations will be necessary: first, how we may be assured that there is a judgment to come, that any one *shall come to judge.* Secondly, in case we be assured that there shall be a judgment, how it appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is, that Christ, shall be the judge. Thirdly, in

case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that Christ shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgment shall consist, how this action shall be performed: and more than this cannot be necessary to make us understand that *he shall come to judge.*

That there is a judgment to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whether we consider ourselves who are to undergo it, or God who is to execute it. If we do but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence, that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgment hereafter is to pass upon us. There is in the soul of every man a conscience, and wheresoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to do, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them: and if it did no more, it would only prove that there is a judgment in this life, and every man his own judge. But being it doth not only allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; being it doth not only disprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearful expectation and terror in us; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life: it followeth that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witness, bound over to give testimony, for or against us, at some judgment after this life to pass upon us. For all men are *a law unto themselves,* and have *the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.*

Rom. ii. 14, 15, 16.

Again, if we consider the God who made us, and hath full dominion over us, whether we look upon him in himself, or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgment from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the Judge of all mankind, *so that a man shall say, Verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.* Now the same God who is our Judge is, by an attribute necessary and inseparable, just; and this justice is so essential to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be just. It was a rational expostulation which Abraham made, *Shall not the judge of all*

295

Ps. lviii. 11.

Gen. xviii. 25.

the earth do right? We may therefore infallibly conclude that God is a most just Judge; and if he be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of Providence, they shew no sign of an universal justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable, as if they were punished for their innocency. Nothing more certain than that in this life rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins of men. Which consideration will enforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no judge of the actions of mankind; or if there be a judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or punishments; or lastly, if there be a judge, and that judge be just, then is there a judgment in another world, and the effects thereof concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge, which judgeth the earth; being we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confess that God is most just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgment yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of all his actions.

From hence the heathen, having always had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man, and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a judgment to come. Insomuch that when St. Paul *reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come,* Acts xxiv. 25. *Felix trembled.* The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a preconception which he had of judgment after death, now heightened by the Apostle's particular description, created an horror in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same Apostle discoursing to the Athenians, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this Article of our Creed, that God *hath appointed a day in the which he will judge* Acts xvii. 31, 32. *the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead;* found *some* which *mocked when they heard of*

the resurrection of the dead, but against the day of judgment none replied. That was a principle of their own[89], that was confessed by all who either believed themselves, or a God; a conscience, or a Deity.

But yet, beside the consideration of the eternal power of 296
conscience in ourselves, beside the intuition of that essential attribute, the justice of God, (which are sufficient arguments to move all men,) we have yet a more near and enforcing persuasion grounded upon the express determination of the will of God. For the determinate counsel of the will of the Almighty actually to judge the world in righteousness, is clearly revealed
Heb. ix. 27. in his word; *It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.* There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a judgment to follow that death; the one as certain as the other. For in all ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge the world.

Upon the first remarkable action after the fall, there is a
Gen. iv. 7. sufficient intimation given to angry Cain; *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door;* which by the most ancient interpretation signifieth a

89 This principle of a judgment to come, Justin Martyr propounds to the Gentiles, as generally acknowledged by all their writers, and as the great encouragement of his Apology for the Christian religion: Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἡμῖν ὁ περὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεοσεβείας πρόκειται λόγος, ἣς οὐδὲν, οἶμαι, προτιμότερον τοῖς ἀκινδύνως βιοῦν προῃρημένοις εἶναι νενόμισται, διὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦδε τοῦ βίου ἔσεσθαι κρίσιν· ἣν οὐ μόνον οἱ ἡμέτεροι κατὰ Θεὸν κηρύττουσι πρόγονοι, προφῆταί τε καὶ νομοθέται, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν νομισθέντες εἶναι σοφοὶ, οὐ ποιηταὶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόσοφοι οἱ τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θείαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι παρ' ὑμῖν εἰδέναι γνῶσιν. *Cohort. ad Græcos,* §. 1. [p. 6 B.] Tertullian shews the same not only from the writings but the constant conversation and language even of the Gentiles: 'Anima—licet carcere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidinibus ac concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis diis exancillata, cum tamen resipiscit, ut ex crapula, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, et sanitatem suam patitur, Deum nominat, hoc solo nomine, quia proprio Dei veri. Deus magnus, Deus bonus, et, Quod Deus dederit, omnium vox est; judicem quoque contestatur illum, Deus videt, et, Deo commendo, et, Deus mihi reddet. O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ!' *Apologet. adv. Gentes, cap.* 17. [p. 17 A.] Indeed the ancient Gentiles have expressed this judgment to come very exactly: as Philemon cited by Justin Martyr *de Monarch.* §. 3. [p. 38 D.]

Ἔστιν Δίκης ὀφθαλμὸς, ὃς τὰ πάνθ' ὁρᾷ.
Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἀσεβὴς ἔξουσιν ἓν,
Ἅρπαζ' ἀπελθὼν, κλέπτ', ἀποστέρει, κύκα.
Μηδὲν πλανηθῇς, ἔστι κἂν ᾅδου κρίσις,
Ἥνπερ ποιήσει Θεὸς ὁ πάντων δεσπότης,
Οὗ τοὔνομα φοβερὸν, οὐδ' ἂν ὀνομάσαιμ' ἐγώ.

And Plato especially hath delivered it according to their notion most particularly, whose places to that purpose are faithfully collected by Eusebius and Theodoret, and may be read in them; *Euseb. de Præpar. Evang. lib.* xi. *cap.* 38. *et lib.* xii. *cap.* 6. *Theodoret Serm.* xi. *de Fine et Judicio* [vol. iv. p. 649 C.]; where after the citation of several places he concludes, Οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστευεν ὁ Πλάτων εἶναι τὰ ἐν ᾅδου κριτήρια.

reservation of his sin unto the judgment of the world to come[90]. Before the flood Enoch prophesied of a judgment to come, *saying*, Jude 14, 15. *Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* His words might have an aim at the waters which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention looked through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.

The testimonies which follow in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions of Christ and the Apostles, are so many and so known, that both the number and the plainness will excuse the prosecution. The throne hath been already seen, the Judge hath appeared sitting on it, the books have been already opened, the dead small and great have been seen standing before him; there is nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamental, than that of *eternal judgment*. I Heb. vi. 2. shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from the essential attribute, the justice of God, from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this, and in relation to another life, there is a judgment to come, there *shall* some person *come to judge*.

Our second consideration followeth, (seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgment;) who that person is which *shall come to judge*, who shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the judiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The Law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which

90 So the Targum of Jonathan renders it; הלא אם תיטיב עובדך ישתבק לך חובך ואין לא תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדן ליום דינא רבא תטאך נטיר: *If thou makest thy works good, shall not thy sin be forgiven thee? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin is kept unto the day of the great judgment.* And the Jerusalem Targum yet more expressly; הלא אין תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדין ישתרי וישתבק לך לעלמא דאתי ואין לא תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדין ליום דינא רבא תטאך נטיר: *If thou makest thy works good in this world, shall it not be remitted and forgiven unto thee in the world to come? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin shall be reserved unto the day of the great judgment.* In the same manner the Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos, ליום־דינא תטאך נטיר.

are to be discussed were due to him, the persons which are to
Heb. xii. 23. be tried are subject to his dominion; *God* therefore is *the Judge*
Eccl. xii. 14. *of all.* He *shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil;* and so the last
Rom. ii. 5. day, that *day of wrath,* is *the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.* Now if God, as God, be the Judge of all, then whoso- 297
ever is God is Judge of all men; and therefore being we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost, to be God, it followeth that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost shall judge the world[91]; because the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in respect of the same Divinity, have the same autocratorical power, dominion, and authority.

But notwithstanding in that particular day of the general judgment to come, the execution of this judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by
Acts xvii. 31. him. For *God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained.*
John v. 22. It is God who judgeth, it is Christ by whom he judgeth. *For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.* There is therefore an original, supreme, autocratorical, judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost; Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost con-
John v. 27. comitantly. For *the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man;* not simply, because he is a man, therefore he shall be judge, (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should only judge,) but because of the three Persons which are God, he only is also the Son of man[92]; and therefore for his affinity with their nature,

91 Πάρεστι τοίνυν ἐν τῇ κρίσει τότε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πάντων πατὴρ, συγκαθεζομένου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συμπαρόντος Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* 15. [c. 24. p. 237 C.]

92 This explication I thought necessary to insert, because it seems to me the only way to end that controversy which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of St. John, which we ordinarily read thus, 27. Καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. 28. Μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. By which distinction, those words, *because he is the Son of man,* have reference to the precedent sentence. But anciently they have been otherwise distinguished; Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν. Ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. So the old Syriac transla-

for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest mildness and sweetness of equity, in the severity of that just and irrespective judgment.

Nor was this a reason only in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look only upon his being the Son of man, but also upon what he did and suffered as the Son of man. He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature; in that nature so taken, he humbled himself to all the infirmities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which this life could bring; to all the pains and sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause: and therefore in regard of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of the exaltation due unto him was this power of judging. *The Father* therefore, who is only God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or angels, *judgeth no man* (and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost); 598 *but hath committed all judgment to the Son;* and the reason why he hath committed it to him is, *because he is,* not only *the Son of God,* and so truly God, but also *the Son of man,* and so truly

John v. 22, 25, 27.

tion, v. 27. ואשלטה דנהוא עבד אף דינא, and then, v. 28. דברה הו דין דאנשא לא תתמרון בהדא. And St. Chrysostom is so earnest for this reading, that he chargeth the former distinction upon Paulus Samosatenus, as invented by him in favour of his heresy, that Christ was nothing else but purely man. Ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ, μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. Παῦλος μὲν ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς οὐχ οὕτω φησίν· ἀλλὰ πῶς; Ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· ἀλλ' οὐδεμίαν ἀκολουθίαν ἔχει τοῦτο οὕτω λεγόμενον· (so he argues against that reading) οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἔλαβε κρίσιν ὅτι ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν (ἐπεὶ τί ἐκώλυε πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι κριτάς;) ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἀῤῥήτου οὐσίας ἐκείνης ἐστὶν υἱὸς, διὰ τοῦτό ἐστι κριτής. Οὕτω τοίνυν ἀναγνωστέον, Ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ, μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. *Ad locum.* [in Joan. Hom. 39. §. 3. vol. viii. p. 230 A.] Euthymius followeth the distinction of St. Chrysostom, and Theophylact makes the same argument: Χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον δογματίζων τὸν Κύριον, οὕτως ἀνεγίνωσκε τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, Καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ στίζων, ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ἀνεγίνωσκε τὸ, Μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. Ἀνόητον δὲ τελείως ἐστὶ τὸ οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν, τὴν γὰρ κρίσιν δέδωκε τῷ Υἱῷ ὁ Πατὴρ, οὐχ ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Θεός. [p. 632 A.] But though this division of the words be both by St. Chrysostom and Theophylact charged upon Paulus Samosatenus the heretic, yet we find no other distinction in the ancient copies; nor did the ancient Latin Fathers any otherwise read it than that Paulus did. We must then acknowledge no other coherence than the ordinary, that God gave his Son power to judge, because he was the Son of man. Nor need we, to avoid the argument of St. Chrysostom, change the ὅτι into καθότι, the *quia* into *quatenus;* for it is not rendered as the absolute reason in itself, but in relation unto God, or the Persons of the Trinity: the Father shall not judge, nor the Holy Ghost, because those two Persons are only God: but all judgment is committed to God the Son, because he is the Son of man.

man; *because he is* that *Son of man* who suffered so much for the sons of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not only that it is a certain truth that Christ shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why *he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God, so highly to reward that Son of man, as to make him Judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemned to die, and died that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to stand before
Matt.xxvii. 22. the tribunal and receive that sentence, *Let him be crucified*[93]; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ himself did shew at the same time when he stood before the judg-
Matt.xxvi. 64. ment-seat, saying, *Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*

Again, if we look upon ourselves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather than him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of Israel could not bear the presence of God as a Lawgiver, but desired to receive the Law by the hand of Moses; how should we appear before the presence of that God judging us for the breach of that Law, were it not for a better Mediator, of the same nature that Moses was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodness of God, that making a general judgment, he will make a visible Judge, which all may see who shall be
Heb.xii.14. judged. *Without holiness no man shall ever see God;* and therefore if God, as only God, should pronounce sentence upon all

[93] 'Veniet [Christus] ut judicet qui stetit sub judice: veniet in ea forma, in qua judicatus est, ut videant in quem pupugerunt. Cognoscant Judæi quem negaverunt; convincat eos ille homo susceptus, et ab eis crucifixus.' *Auctor lib. de Symb. ad Catechum. lib.* ii. *cap.* 8. §. 17. [Augustin. Op. vol. vi. p. 564 D.] 'Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet: ille qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus: ille qui judicatus est, veniet judicaturus: ille qui stetit ante hominem, judicaturus est omnem hominem.' *Idem, lib.* iii. *cap.* 8. §. 8. [p. 573 E.] 'Judex hic erit Filius hominis; forma illa hic judicabit quæ judicata est. Audite et intelligite: jam hoc propheta dixerat, *Videbunt in quem pupugerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt, quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Judex, qui steti sub judice. Damnabit veros reos, qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet, forma illa veniet.' *S. August. de Verb. Dom. Serm.* lxiv. *cap.* 7. [Serm. CXXVII. 10. vol. v. p. 624 F.]

men, the ungodly should never see their Judge[94]. But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, Christ who is both God and man is appointed Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they only shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God, and the Son of man, he which was *born of the Virgin Mary*, he which *suffered under Pontius Pilate*, he which *was crucified, dead and buried*, and *descended into hell, he* which *rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven*, and is *set down on the right hand of God; he*, the same person, in the same nature, *shall come to judge the quick*
299 *and the dead. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his* Matt. xvi. *Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man* 27. *according to his works.* He then which is to come is the Son of man; and when he cometh, it is to judge. *The same Jesus* Acts i. 11. *which was taken up from* the Apostles *into heaven, shall so come in like manner as* they saw *him go into heaven.* That Son of man then, which is to judge, is our Jesus, even *the same Jesus*, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will *judge* Acts xvii. *the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained;* 31. *whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.* He then which ascended into heaven was the same which was raised from the dead; and by that resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he* Rom. xiv. 9.

94 'Cum et boni et mali visuri sint Judicem vivorum et mortuorum, proculdubio eum videre mali non poterunt, nisi secundum formam qua Filius hominis est; sed tamen in claritate in qua judicabit, non in humilitate in qua judicatus est. Cæterum illam Dei formam in qua æqualis est Patri, proculdubio impii non videbunt. Non enim sunt mundicordes; *Beati* enim *mundicordes, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt.*' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* i. *cap.* 13. [§. 28. vol. viii. p. 768 B.] 'Hoc rectum erat, ut judicandi viderent judicem. Judicandi enim erant et boni et mali. *Beati* autem *mundi corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt.* Restabat ut in judicio forma servi et bonis et malis ostenderetur, forma Dei solis bonis servaretur.' *Idem, de Verb. Dom. Serm.* lxiv. *cap.* 7. [Serm. cxxvii. 10. vol. v. p. 625 A.] '*Et potestatem dedit ei et judicium facere, quoniam Filius hominis est.* Puto nihil esse manifestius. Nam quia Filius Dei est æqualis Patri, non accipit hanc potestatem judicii faciendi, sed habet illam cum Patre in occulto: accipit autem illam, ut boni et mali eum videant judicantem, quia Filius hominis est. Visio quippe Filii hominis exhibebitur et malis: nam visio formæ Dei non nisi mundis corde, quia *ipsi Deum videbunt,* id est, solis piis [exhibebitur,] quorum dilectioni hoc ipsum promittit, quia seipsum ostendit illis.' *Idem, de Trin. lib.* i. *cap.* 13. [§. 30. vol. viii. p. 769 F.]

might be Lord both of the dead and living. It appeareth therefore by God's determination, by Christ's resurrection and ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

This office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist representeth him *that cometh after* him, by this deli-
Matt. iii. 12. neation of an husbandman; *Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire*[95]. The Son of man describes himself as an householder, saying to the
Matt. xiii. 30, 39. reapers in the time of harvest, *Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn:* and this *harvest is the end of the world*[96]. He repre-
Matt. xiii. 47, 48. senteth himself under the notion of a fisherman, *casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full,* he *drew to the shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.* He is the Bridegroom who took
Matt. xxv. 10. the wise virgins *with him to the marriage,* and *shut the door* upon the foolish. He is the Man who, travelling into a far country,
Matt. xxv. 19, 21, 30. delivered the talents to his servants, and *after a long time* cometh again, *and reckoneth with them,* exalting the *good and faithful,* and casting the *unprofitable servant into outer darkness.* Lastly, he is the Shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to
Matt. xxv. 31, 32, 33. this judgment. For *when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left.* Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man; as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime from the chaff, sometime from the tares; as a fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins; as a master distinguishing the servants of his family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the

95 Ἀνωτέρω μὲν τὴν κόλασιν εἶπεν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὸν κριτὴν δείκνυσι, καὶ τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀθάνατον εἰσάγει. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. xi. §. 5. vol. vii. p. 155 C.]

96 Πάλιν ἀναμιμνήσκει αὐτοὺς τῶν Ἰωάννου ῥημάτων τῶν κριτὴν αὐτὸν εἰσαγόντων. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. xlvi. §. 2. vol. vii. p. 482 D.]

unprofitable; as a shepherd, dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the Son of man is appointed the judge of all the sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge; which is the second consideration subservient to the present explication.

Thirdly, It being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this judgment be; in what that judicial action doth consist; what he shall then do, when *he shall come to judge*. The reality of this act doth certainly consist in the final determination, and actual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternal condition: and in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not so certain unto us[97]; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary process. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunal, a judgment-seat: for *in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory:* and that this throne is a seat not only of majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, *Ye also shall sit upon the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* As in that vision in the Revelation, *I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them. And I saw a great white throne, and him that sate on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away.* This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgment-seat, when the Apostle tells us, *We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,* and, *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ.* In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a throne of judicature. Secondly, There is to be a personal appearance of all men before that seat of judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for *we must all appear,* and *we shall all stand before* that *judgment-seat. I saw the dead,* saith the Apostle, *stand before* the throne of *God.* Thus *all nations shall be gathered before him. He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds,*

300

Matt. xix. 28.

Rev. xx. 4, 11.

Rom. xiv. 10. 2 Cor. v. 10.

Rev. xx. 12.

Matt. xxv. 32. Matt. xxiv. 31.

97 St. Austin speaking of the particulars foretold to be exhibited at the day of judgment, concludes them in this manner: 'Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est: sed quibus modis, et quo ordine veniant, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quam nunc valet consequi ad perfectum hominum intelligentia.' *De Civit. Dei, lib.* xx. *cap.* 30. [vol. vii. p. 617 B.]

2 Thess. ii. 1. *from one end of heaven to the other.* For *the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ* is *our gathering together unto him.* Thirdly, When those which are to be judged are brought before the judgment-
1 Cor. iv. 5. seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear: he *will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels*
Eccles. xii. 14. *of the hearts:* he will *bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.* To this end,
Dan. vii. 10. in the vision of Daniel, when *the judgment was set, the books were*
Rev. xx. 12. *opened;* and in that of St. John, *the books were opened; and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works.* Fourthly, After the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a definitive sentence passed upon all their persons, according to those actions, which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgment[98]; the
Matt. xxv. 34. sentence of absolution, in these words expressed, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;* the sentence of condemnation in this
Verse 41. manner, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.* Lastly, After the promulgation of
Verse 46. the sentence, followeth the execution: as it is written, *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Thus appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne; his authority, by convening all before him; his knowledge and wisdom, by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations; his justice, in condemning sinners; his mercy, in absolving believers; his power, in the execution of his sentence. And thus the Son of man *shall come to judge,* which is the last particular subservient to the third consideration of this Article.

The fourth and last consideration is, what is the object of this action; who are the persons which shall appear before that Judge, and receive their sentence from him; what is the latitude of that expression, *the quick and the dead.* The phrase itself is delivered several times in the Scriptures, and that upon the
Acts x. 42. same occasion; for Christ was *ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead,* and so his commission extendeth to both: he
1 Pet. iv. 5. *is ready to judge the quick and the dead;* his resolution reacheth
2 Tim. iv. 1. to each; and as he is ordained and ready, so *shall he judge*

[98] 'Dominus non accepta persona judicat mundum, unusquisque secundum quæ facit accipit. Si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum antecedit; si nequam, merces nequitiæ eum sequitur.' *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 4. [p. 60.]

the quick and the dead; the execution excludeth neither. But although it be the Scripture language, and therefore certainly true; yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident.

301 The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in several notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of several interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body only remaineth dead; therefore some have understood the souls of men by *the quick*, and their bodies by *the dead*[99]: and then the meaning will be this, that Christ shall come to judge immediately upon the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joined to the bodies which were once dead; and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul, for all those actions which the soul committed in the body. Now though this be a truth, that men shall be judged when their souls and bodies are united; though they shall be judged according to those works which their souls have acted in their bodies; yet this is not to be acknowledged as the interpretation of this Article, for two reasons: first, because it is not certain that all men shall die, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls: secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

Again, Because the Scripture often mentioneth a death in trespasses and sins, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by *the quick* to be understood the just, and by *the dead* the unjust[1]: so that Christ shall judge *the quick*, that is the just, by a sentence of absolution; and *the dead*, that is the unjust, by a sentence of condemnation. But though the dead be sometimes taken for sinners, and the living for the righteous, though it be true that Christ shall judge them both; yet it is not probable that in this particular they should be taken in a figurative or metaphorical sense, because there is no adjunct

99 So Theophylact testifieth; *Τινὲς δὲ καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα ἐνόησαν. Com. in* 2 *Tim.* iv. 1. Indeed Isidorus Pelusiota giveth this as the first interpretation: *Τὸ κρίνεσθαι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, τοῦτό ἐστι, τὸ καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς κρίσιν ἐλεύσεσθαι, καὶ οὔτε ἓν θατέρου κεχωρισμένον· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ κοινὴν τὴν ἐνταῦθα συνάφειαν ἐποιήσαντο, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖθεν δίκην ἡνωμένως ὑφέξουσιν. Lib.* i. *Epist.* 222. [p. 64 D.]

1 This is the second exposition delivered by Isidorus Pelusiota to such as are not satisfied with the first; *Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ζητεῖς, οὕτω διάκριναι, ζῶντας, τοὺς ἀείζωον βίον καὶ θεοφιλῆ μετελθόντας, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἀτελευτήτους ἀμοιβὰς, κρῖναι τοὺς νεκρωθέντας τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι, καὶ τὸ δοθὲν αὐτοῖς τάλαντον ὡς ἐν τάφῳ τῇ ἑαυτῶν καταχώσαντας ῥᾳθυμίᾳ, καὶ ἀμύνασθαι αὐτούς. Lib.* i. Epist. 222. [p. 64 E.]

giving any such intimation, and because the literal sense affordeth a fair explication: further yet, because the Scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corporeal death: *Whether we live or die,* saith the Apostle, *we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

Rom. xiv. 8, 9.

Thirdly, Therefore by *the dead* are understood all those who ever died before the time of Christ's coming to judgment, and by *the quick* such as shall be then alive[2]: so that the quick and 302
the dead, literally taken, are considered in relation to the time of Christ's coming; at which time there shall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and before which time all the generations passed since the creation of the world shall be numbered among the dead. And this undoubtedly is the proper and literal sense of the Article[3], that Christ shall come to

2 This is the third exposition of Isidorus Pelusiota: Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως, οὕτως, κρῖναι τοὺς τότε ζῶντας καταλειφθέντας, καὶ τοὺς ἤδη πρὸ αὐτῶν κοιμηθέντας. *Lib.* i. *Epist.* 222. [p. 64 E.] Others of the Fathers give the second and the third explication, leaving it indifferent, and preferring neither; as St. Chrysostom: Ἤτοι ἁμαρτωλοὺς λέγει καὶ δικαίους, ἤτοι καὶ τοὺς ἀπελθόντας καὶ τοὺς νῦν ὄντας, ὅτι πολλοὶ καταλειφθήσονται ζῶντες. *Com. in 2 Tim.* iv. 1. [Hom. ix. §. 1. vol. xi. p. 715 A.] 'Duobus autem modis accipi potest, quod vivos et mortuos judicabit: sive ut vivos intelligamus, quos hic nondum mortuos, sed adhuc in ista carne viventes inventurus est ejus adventus; mortuos autem, qui de corpore, priusquam veniat, exierunt vel exituri sunt: sive vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos; quoniam justi quoque judicabuntur.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 54. [§. 14. vol. vi. p. 216 G.] 'Credimus etiam *inde venturum* convenientissimo tempore et *judicaturum vivos et mortuos.* Sive istis nominibus justi et peccatores significentur; sive quos tunc ante mortem in terris inventurus est appellati sint vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resurrecturi sunt.' *Idem, de Fide et Symb. cap.* 8. [§. 15. vol. vi. p. 157 E.] '*Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Vivos,* qui superfuerint; *mortuos,* qui præcesserint. Potest et sic intelligi; *vivos,* justos; *mortuos,* injustos: utrosque enim judicat, sua cuique retribuens. Justis dicturus est in judicio, *Venite benedicti,* &c.—Sinistris quid? *Ite in ignem,* &c. Sic judicabuntur a Christo vivi et mortui.' *Auctor. lib.* i. *de Symb. ad Catechum. cap.* 4. §. 11. [Augustin. Op. vol. vi. p. 553 E.] 'Duobus modis hæc sententia accipitur. Vivi et mortui in anima; item vivi et mortui in corpore. Secundum priorem, judicabit vivos in anima, credentes; et mortuos in anima, fidem nullam habentes: secundum posteriorem, judicabit vivos in carne, quos præsentes invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit et mortuos in carne, quos resuscitaturus est Deus excelsus.' *Auctor lib.* iv. *de Symb. ad Catechum. cap.* 8. §. 8. [ib. p. 580 E.] But although these two expositions were thus indifferently propounded, yet the former ought by no means so to be received as any way to evacuate or prejudice the latter. 'Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini *vivos ac mortuos* judicandos, non solum justos et peccatores significari, sicut Diodorus putat; sed et vivos eos qui in carne inveniendi sunt credimus, qui adhuc morituri creduntur; vel immutandi sunt, ut alii volunt, ut suscitati continuo vel reformati, cum ante mortuis judicentur.' *Gennad. de Dogm. Eccles. cap.* 8. [p. 77 A.]

3 This is the clear interpretation of

judge, not only those which shall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but also all such as have lived and died before. None shall be then judged while they are dead: whosoever stand before the judgment-seat shall appear alive; but those which never died shall be judged as they were alive; those which were dead before, that they may be judged, shall rise to life. He shall judge therefore *the quick*, that is those which shall be then alive when he cometh; and he shall judge *the dead*, that is those which at the same time shall be raised from the dead[4].

The only doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whether those which shall be found alive when our Saviour cometh, shall still so continue till they come to judgment; or upon his first appearance they shall die, and after death revive, and so, together with all those which rise out of their graves, appear before the judgment-seat? The consideration of our mortality, and the cause thereof, (that it is appointed for all men once to die, in that death hath passed upon all,) might persuade us that the last generation of mankind should taste of death as well as all the rest that went before it; and therefore it hath been thought, especially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds alive, shall immediately die[5]; and after a sudden and universal expiration, shall be restored to life again, and joined with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the resurrection.

Heb. ix. 27. Rom. v. 12.

But the Apostle's description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. For *we which are*

1 Thess. iv. 15, 16, 17.

Theodoret, without the least mention of any other; Νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κριτὴν τὸν Κύριον κέκληκεν, ἐπειδὰν καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνίστησι, καὶ εἰς τὸ κριτήριον ἄγει, καὶ τοὺς κατὰ τὸν τῆς συντελείας καιρὸν εὑρισκομένους ἐνδύων τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, ἀπαιτεῖ τὰς εὐθύνας. Πάντες γὰρ, φησὶν, οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα. *Com. in 2 Tim.* iv. 1. [vol. iii. p. 503 C.] 'Vivi agnoscuntur qui in corpore erunt in adventu Domini, mortui qui ex hac luce migraverunt.' *Auctor Expos. Symb. sub nomine S. Chrysost.*

4 This is cleared by the author of the Questions and Answers under the name of Justin Martyr; Εἰ τὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δῶρον πᾶσι τοῖς θανοῦσιν ὁ Θεὸς διδόναι ὑπέσχετο, καὶ πάντες ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἀναστάντες τῷ κριτῇ παρίστασθαι μέλλουσι, πῶς πληρωθήσεται τὸ, κρίνειν νεκροὺς καὶ ζῶντας τὸν Κύριον; πῶς δὲ νεκροὶ κριθῆναι δυνήσονται, ὧν τὰ μὲν σώματα ἐν μνήμασιν ἔρριπται, αἱ δὲ ψυχαὶ τῶν σωμάτων κεχωρισμέναι εἰσίν; *Resp.* Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοιμηθησόμεθα· κρινεῖ οὖν ζῶντας μὲν, τοὺς τότε ζῶντας· νεκροὺς δὲ, τοὺς ἀνισταμένους ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. *Quæst.* 109. [p. 487 C.]

5 'Omnium enim hominum erit resurrectio. Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors ab Adam ducta omnibus filiis ejus dominetur: et maneat illud privilegium in Domino, quod de eo specialiter dicitur, *Non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.* Hanc rationem maxima Patrum turba tradente suscepimus.' *Gennad. de Dogm. Eccles. cap.* 7. [p. 76 C.]

alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord. In which words, they which *remain unto the coming of the Lord*, are not said to die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from those *which are asleep* and *rise first;* yea, being alive, are caught up together with them, having not tasted death[6].

1 Cor. xv. 51. The same is farther confirmed by the same Apostle, saying, *Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.* Which being added to the former, putteth this doctrine out of question: for the living which remain at the coming of Christ are opposed to them which are asleep, and the opposition consists in this, that they *shall not sleep;* which sleep is not opposed to a long death, but to death itself, as it followeth,

Verse 52. *the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we* (which shall not 303 sleep) *shall be changed;* so that their mutation shall be unto them as a resurrection[7]. And the collation of these two Scrip-

6 This is the observation of Epiphanius, who from these words proves as much: for having repeated the text, he thus infers; Ἀπὸ τῶν συνεζευγμένων ἑκάστης λέξεώς ἐστιν ἰδεῖν τὰ ἐπίχειρα· διαιρῶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος Ἀπόστολος τῶν δύο τρόπων τὸ εἶδος, εἰς μίαν ἐλπίδα συνήγαγεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ, Ἡμεῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῦ· ἵνα δείξῃ ὄντως τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐχ ἕτερον παρὰ τοῦτο· ὁ γὰρ ἁρπαγεὶς οὔπω τέθνηκε. *Hæres.* lxiv. §. 70. [vol. i. p. 601 A.]

7 'Nam et hoc gemimus, domicilium nostrum, quod de cœlo est, superindui desiderantes; siquidem induti et non nudi inveniamur;' id est, ante volumus superinduere virtutem cœlestem æternitatis, quam carne exuamur. Hujus enim gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini deprehendentur in carne, et propter duritias temporum Antichristi merebuntur, compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ, concurrere cum resurgentibus, sicut Thessalonicensibus scribit.' *Tertul. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 41. [p. 350 A.] 'Sancti, qui die consummationis atque judicii in corporibus reperiendi sunt, cum aliis sanctis, qui ex mortuis resurrecturi sunt, rapientur *in nubibus obviam Christo in aera*, et non gustabunt mortem, eruntque semper cum Domino, gravissima mortis necessitate calcata: unde ait Apostolus, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur.*' *Theod. Heracleotes Com. ad loc. apud S. Hieron. Epist.* 152. [Epist. CXIX. 2. vol. i. p. 794 D.] 'Apollinarius, licet aliis verbis, eadem, quæ Theodorus, asseruit; quosdam non esse morituros, et de præsenti vita rapiendos in futuram; ut, mutatis glorificatisque corporibus, sint cum Christo.' *S. Hieron. ibid.* [p. 795 C.] Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστιν· Οὐ πάντες μὲν ἀποθανούμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντες· θνητοὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνοι. Μὴ τοίνυν, ἐπειδὰν ἀποθνήσκειs, διὰ τοῦτο δείσῃς, φησὶν, ὡς οὐκ ἀναστησόμενος· εἰσὶ γάρ, τινές εἰσιν, οἳ καὶ τοῦτο διαφεύξονται· καὶ ὅμως οὐκ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐκείνην, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ ἐκεῖνα τὰ σώματα τὰ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντα ἀλλαγῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταπεσεῖν. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. XLII. §. 2. vol. x. p. 396 C.] So St. Jerom speaking of that place, 1 Thess. iv. 'Hoc ex ipsius loci conti-

tures maketh up this conclusion so manifestly, that I conceive no man had ever doubted or questioned the truth of it, had they not first differed in the reading of the text[8].

nentia sciri potest, quod sancti, qui in adventu Salvatoris fuerint deprehensi in corpore, in iisdem corporibus occurrant ei, ita tamen, ut inglorium, et corruptivum, et mortale, gloria, et incorruptione, et immortalitate mutetur: ut, qualia corpora mortuorum surrectura sint, in talem substantiam etiam vivorum corpora transformentur.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 148. *ad Marcell.* [Epist. LIX. 3. p. 326 D.] And St. Augustin, in relation to the same place; 'Revera, quantum ad verba beati Apostoli pertinet, videtur asserere quosdam in fine sæculi, adveniente Domino, cum futura est resurrectio mortuorum, non esse morituros, sed vivos repertos, in illam immortalitatem, quæ sanctis etiam cæteris datur, repente mutandos, et simul *cum illis rapiendos*, sicut dicit, *in nubibus*. Nec aliquid aliud mihi visum est, quoties de his verbis volui cogitare.' *S. August. ad tertiam Quæst. Dulcitii.* [§. 2. vol. vi. p. 131 A.] These and others of the ancients have clearly delivered this truth, so that Gennadius, notwithstanding his *maxima Patrum turba* for the contrary, did well confess, 'Verum quia sunt et alii æque catholici et eruditi viri, qui credunt, anima in corpore manente, immutandos ad incorruptionem et immortalitatem eos qui in adventu Domini vivi inveniendi sunt, et hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem præsentis vitæ immutatione deponant, non morte. Quolibet quis acquiescat modo, non est hæreticus, nisi ex contentione hæreticus fiat.' *De Dogm. Eccles. cap.* 7. [p. 77 A.]

8 There have been observed three several readings of that place, 1 Cor. xv. 51. one of the Latin, two of the Greek. 'Illud autem breviter in fine commoneo, hoc, quod in Latinis codicibus legitur, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, non omnes autem immutabimur*, in Græcis voluminibus non haberi, sed vel, *Omnes dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*; vel, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 152. [Epist. CXIX. 12. vol. i. p. 810 C.] But there was not one of these three only in the Latin copies, that is the first; but one which was in the Greek was also in the Latin, that is the second. For both these St. Austin takes notice of: 'Nam et illud quod in plerisque codicibus legitur, *Omnes resurgemus*, unde fieri poterit, nisi omnes moriamur? Resurrectio quippe, nisi mors præcesserit, nulla est. Et quod nonnulli codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, multo facilius et apertius id cogit intelligi.' *Ad tertiam Quæst. Dulcitii.* [§. 3. vol. vi. p. 131 B.] 'Sed aliud rursus occurrit, quod idem dixit Apostolus, cum de resurrectione corporum ad Corinthios loqueretur: *Omnes resurgemus*, vel, sicut alii codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*.' *Idem, De Civit. Dei, lib.* XX. *cap.* 20. [vol. vii. p. 599 F.] Two readings thereof were anciently in the Latin, two in the Greek; one of the Greek in the Latin, and no more. First then that reading, *Omnes quidem resurgemus*, &c. which is at this day in the Vulgar Latin, was by the testimony of St. Jerom and St. Austin the ordinary reading in their times, and is also used by Tertullian; 'Horum demutationem ad Corinthios reddit, dicens; *Omnes quidem resurgemus, non autem omnes demutabimur*.' *De Resur. Carn. cap.* 42. [p. 350 B.] And although St. Jerom testifieth that it was not to be found in the Greek copies, yet to the same purpose it is amongst the *Variæ Lectiones March. Veles.* Πάντες ἀναβιώσομεν, ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντες ἀπαλλαγησόμεθα. And *in Codice Claromontano*, the Greek is erased in this place, but the Latin left is, *Omnes quidem resurgemus*. As for the second reading, *Omnes dormiemus*, &c. this was anciently in the Latin copies, according to St. Austin; and also in the Greek, according to St. Jerom. Didymus did so read it, and contend for that reading: 'Scio quod in nonnullis codicibus scriptum sit, *Non quidem omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*. Sed considerandum, an ei, quod præmissum est, *Omnes immutabimur*, possit convenire quod sequitur, *Mortui resurgent incorrupti, et nos immutabimur*. Si enim omnes immutabuntur, et hoc commune

Wherefore being the place to the Thessalonians sufficiently proves it of itself, being that to the Corinthians, as we read it, invincibly confirmeth the same truth, I conclude that the living, when Christ shall come, are properly distinguished from all those 304
which die before his coming; because death itself hath passed upon the one, and only a change different from death shall pass upon the other; and so conceive that Christ is called the Lord and Judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the Creed. For although it be true of the living of any age to say that Christ is Lord and Judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next age they are not the living but the dead which Christ shall come to judge, and consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick which he shall judge. As therefore to the interpretation of this Article, I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the world all the

cum cæteris est, superfluum fuit dicere, *Et nos immutabimur*. Quamobrem ita legendum est, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non omnes autem immutabimur.*' *Apud S. Hieron. Epist.* 152. [Epist. CXIX. 5. p. 795 E.] Indeed Acacius bishop of Cæsarea doth not only acknowledge this reading, but saith it was in most copies: 'Dicamus primum de eo, quod magis in plurimis codicibus invenitur: *Ecce mysterium dico vobis: omnes quidem dormiemus, non omnes autem immutabimur.* *Apud S. Hieron. Epist.* 152. [ib. p. 798 A.] The Alexandrian MS. may confirm this lection, which reads it thus, Οἱ *πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, for the first *οὐ* is not written in the line, but above it. And the Ethiopic version to the same purpose, *Omnes nos moriemur, sed non omnes nos immutabimur.* The third reading, *Non omnes dormiemus*, &c. though it were not anciently in the Latin, yet it was frequently found in the Greek copies. Acacius testifieth thus much*; 'Transeamus ad secundam lectionem, quæ ita fertur in plerisque codicibus. *Non quidem omnes dormiemus; omnes autem immutabimur.*' *Apud S. Hieron. ibid.* [§. 7. p. 799 B.] It was so anciently read in the time of Origen, as appeareth by the Fragment taken by St. Jerom out of his Ἐξηγητικά upon the first Epistle to the Thessalonians (which he mentioneth himself in his second Book against Celsus) and by his words in the fifth against Celsus; [§. 17. vol. i. p. 589 E.] Οὐχ *ὑπολαβὼν, μετά τινος ἀπορίας* [*ἀποῤῥήτου σοφίας* in the Benedictine ed.] *λελέχθαι παρὰ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸ, Οὐ πάντες κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.* The same is acknowledged by Theodorus Heracleotes, Apollinarius, Didymus, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. The same is confirmed by the ancient Syriac translation: לו כלן נדמך כלן דין נתחלף as also by the Arabic. Being then of the three readings but two were anciently found in the Greek copies; ('Quæritis, quo sensu dictum sit, et quo modo in prima ad Corinthios Epistola Pauli Apostoli sit legendum, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur.* An juxta quædam exemplaria, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur;* utrumque enim in Græcis codicibus invenitur.' *S. Hieron. ibid.* [§. 2. p. 794 E.]) being of those two but one is now to be found, and the Greek Fathers successively have acknowledged no other, being that which is left agrees with the most ancient translations, we have no reason to doubt or question it.

* [They are the words of Jerom himself. Ib. p. 799.]

generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and Christ shall gather them all to his tribunal seat, and so shall truly come to judge both *the quick and the dead*[9].

To believe an universal judgment to come is necessary: first, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God; that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwreck. That which made the Prophet David confess, his *feet were almost gone*, his *steps had well nigh slipped*, hath hurried multitudes of men to eternal perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent miseries of the righteous; the frequent persecutions of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice; the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, and horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious lives, have raised a strong temptation of doubt and mistrust, whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life considered alone, which can give the least rational satisfaction to this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed than here they are, how Ps. lxxiii. 2.

[9] This was well observed by St. Austin: 'Si autem in his verbis Apostoli nullus alius sensus poterit reperiri, et hoc eum intelligi voluisse claruerit, quod videntur ipsa verba clamare; id est, quod futuri sint in fine sæculi, et adventu Domini, qui non exspolientur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate, ut absorbeatur mortale a vita: huic sententiæ proculdubio conveniet, quod in Regula Fidei confitemur, *venturum Dominum, judicaturum vivos et mortuos;* ut non hic intelligamus vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandi sint justi et injusti; sed vivos quos nondum exiisse, mortuos autem quos jam exiisse de corporibus, adventus ejus inveniet.' *Ad tertiam Quæst. Dulcitii.* [§. 4. vol. vi. p. 131 E.] And Origen long before did make the same exposition of those words, *That he might be Lord both of the dead and living;* Rom. xiv. 9. *Ὅρα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις, ὅτι ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κυριεύσῃ, καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ· καὶ οἶδέ γε ὁ ἀπόστολος νεκροὺς μὲν, ὧν κυριεύει ὁ Χριστὸς, τοὺς οὕτω κατειλεγμένους ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους προτέρᾳ (Σαλπίσει γὰρ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι) ζώντας δὲ αὐτοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἀλλαγησομένους, ἑτέρους ὄντας τῶν ἐγερθησομένων νεκρῶν. Ἔχει δὲ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἡ λέξις οὕτως, Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα, ἐξῆς εἰρημένη τῷ, Οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται πρῶτον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς προτέρᾳ ἐν ἑτέραις λέξεσι τὴν αὐτὴν διαφορὰν παριστὰς, φησὶν ἄλλους μὲν εἶναι τοὺς κοιμωμένους, ἄλλους δὲ τοὺς ζῶντας, λέγων, &c. Cont. Cels. lib.* ii. [c. 65. p. 436 E.] Which exposition is far more proper than that of Methodius: *Ἐπὶ τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων παραληπτέον· ζώντων μὲν τῶν ψυχῶν, καθὸ ἀθάνατοι, νεκρῶν δὲ τῶν σωμάτων. Phot. in Bibliothec. Cod.* 234. [p. 301.] And Ruffinus; 'Quod autem dicitur *judicare vivos et mortuos,* non quod alii vivi, alii mortui ad judicium veniant, sed quod animæ simul judicabuntur et corpora, in quibus *vivos* animas, corpora *mortuos* nominavit.' *Expos. in Symb.* [§. 33. p. ccxi.]

can we ground any acknowledgment of an overruling justice? That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth, that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below; it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess, that a just and exact retribution is deferred, that a due and proportionable dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world; and consequently that there is an universal judgment to come.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe a judgment to come, thereby effectually to provoke ourselves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetness of our sins, such the connaturalness of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own soul. But being once persuaded of a judgment, and withal possessed with 305
a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with Felix? who will
Matt. iii. 7. Rom. ii. 5. not *flee from the wrath to come?* what must the *hardness* be of that *impenitent heart* which *treasureth up unto itself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God?* We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all external rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfy any other desires than our own: especially the dictates of the word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not only so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of God's revealed will, that
Rom. ii. 16. *God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel.* There is in every man not only a power to reflect, but a necessary reflection upon his actions; not only a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistible judgment of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence, and wholly unconcerned in our own condemnations. But if we were persuaded that these reflections of conscience are to be so many

witnesses before the tribunal of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and endeavour above all things for a good conscience. For *seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God?* Reason itself will tell us thus much; but if that do not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice, *the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

2 Pet. iii. 11, 12.

Tit. ii. 11, 12, 13.

Thirdly, It is necessary to profess faith in Christ as Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the judgment to come only as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, or happiness at the last day. We must confess that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearful expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. It is necessary therefore that we should believe that Christ shall sit upon the throne, that our Redeemer shall be our Judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the Law, but the mildness and mercies of the Gospel; and then we may look upon not only the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope; whatsoever text administereth any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the judgment to come: because by that Gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose Gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, *we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren.* As *one of our brethren*

Eph. v. 30.

Heb. ii. 11.

Lev. xxv. 48.

he hath *redeemed us,* he hath laid down his life as a ransom for us. He is our High Priest who made an atonement for our 306
Heb. ii. 17. sins, *a merciful and faithful High Priest in* all *things,* being *made like unto his brethren.* He which is Judge is also our Advocate; and who shall condemn us, if he shall pass the sentence upon
Eph. iii. 12. us, who maketh intercession for us? well therefore may *we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him* unto the throne of that Judge, who is our Brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High Priest, who is our Advocate, who will not by his word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already
John v. 24. in the same word absolved us, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.*

Having thus explained the nature of the judgment to come, and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, I believe in him who *shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much: I am fully persuaded of this, as of an infallible and necessary truth, That the eternal Son of God, in that human nature in which he died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, shall certainly come from the same heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those which shall be then alive, and all which ever lived and shall be before that day dead: when causing them all to stand before his judgment-seat, he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh; and passing the sentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormented with the devil and his angels; and pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the elect, shall translate them into his glorious kingdom, of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ *who shall judge the quick and the dead.*

307

ARTICLE VIII.

I believe in the Holy Ghost.

IN this Article we repeat again the first word of the Creed, *I believe;* whereas a conjunction might have been sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son do intervene. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; so we do make confession of our faith, saying, *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*[10]; and the ancients, whose Creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the act of faith, but only an addition of the object, *And in the Holy Ghost*[11]. And as we repeat the act of faith in this Article, so some did also in the second, *I believe in Jesus Christ*[12]. Wherefore being this word, *I believe,* is taken here only by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense and importance of which it was in the beginning of the Creed, it may well receive the same explication here which it received there; to that therefore the reader is referred.

10 'Sed enim ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas, digestis vocibus et literis Domini, admonet nos post hæc credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum olim Ecclesiæ repromissum, sed statutis temporum opportunitatibus redditum.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 29. [p. 727 B.] Schlictingius the Socinian, in his preface to the Polonian Confession of Faith, endeavoureth to persuade us that this Article of the Holy Ghost is not so ancient as the rest; which being diametrically opposite to that original of the Creed, which I have delivered, the baptismal words, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,* it will be necessary to examine his reason, which is drawn only from the authority of Tertullian; who in his book *de Veland. Virg.* reciting the rule of Faith, makes no mention of the Holy Ghost: and *de Præscr. Hæret.* propounds this article no otherwise, '[quam ut credamus] Christum in cœlos receptum sedisse ad dextram Patris, misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti.' *Cap.* 13. [p. 207 A.] But this objection made for the novelty of this article is easily answered. For Irenæus before Tertullian hath it expressly in his Confession, *lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [c. 10.] and calls it the Faith *in Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum;* and also declares, that the Church received that Faith, and preserved it through the whole world.

11 So the ancient Greek MS. καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, and Marcellus, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, as also Arius and Euzoius, and the council of Nice. Thus also the Latins; 'Post hoc ponitur in ordine fidei, *Et in Spiritum Sanctum.*' *Ruffin. in Symb. Max. Taurin. et Auctor lib. de Symb. ad Catechum.* The MS. in the Oxford Library, *Et in Spiritu Sancto.* Others instead of the conjunction made use of *Credo* by way of repetition, as we do: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Chrysol. Euseb. Gallican. Auctor Serm. de Tempore, Etherius Uxam.* the Greek and Latin MS. in Bennet College Library: and, *Credo in Sancto Spiritu. Venantius Fortunatus.*

12 As the ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus.

For although the ancient Fathers did frequently make use of this language to prove the Divinity of the Spirit, and did thence argue that he is really and truly God, because we *believe in the Holy Ghost*[13]; yet being that language is not expressly read in the Scriptures in relation to the Spirit, as it is in reference to the Son; being to believe in the Holy Ghost is only the expression of the Church contained in the Creed; being in the same Creed many of the ancients, without any reprehension, have used the same phrase in the following Articles expressly, and where the preposition is not expressed, it may very well be thought it was understood; therefore I think fit to acquiesce in my former exposition, and lay no greater force in the preposition.

It will therefore be sufficient for the explication of this Article, if we can declare what is the full and proper object of our faith contained in it, what we are obliged to believe 308 concerning the Holy Ghost. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever is required in this exposition, if we can set forth these two particulars, the nature and the office of that blessed Spirit. For the name of *GHOST* or *GAST* in the ancient Saxon language signifieth a spirit, and in that appellation of the Spirit of God, his nature principally is expressed. The addition of holiness, though it denote the

13 Gregory Nazianzen disputing for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, proveth that he is no creature thus: Ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν κτίσμα, πῶς εἰς αὐτὸ πιστεύομεν; ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ τελειούμεθα; οὐ γὰρ ταὐτόν ἐστι πιστεύειν εἴς τι, καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ πιστεύειν· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστι θεότητος, τὸ δὲ παντὸς πράγματος. *Orat.* 37. [Orat. xxxi. §. 6. vol. i. p. 560 A.] Epiphanius seems to speak thus much, shewing that though the Fathers of the Nicene Council had determined nothing particularly of the Holy Ghost, yet they sufficiently shew that he is God, by those words, καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Εὐθὺς γὰρ ἡ ἔκθεσις ὁμολογεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀρνεῖται· Πιστεύομεν γὰρ εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα. Τὸ δὲ πιστεύομεν, οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις εἰς τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' εἰς Θεὸν ἡ πίστις. Καὶ, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' εἰς μίαν δοξολογίαν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἕνωσιν θεότητος, καὶ μίαν ὁμοουσιότητα, εἰς τρία τέλεια, μίαν δὲ θεότητα, μίαν οὐσίαν, μίαν δοξολογίαν, μίαν κυριότητα, ἀπὸ τοῦ πιστεύομεν, [καὶ πιστεύομεν,] καὶ πιστεύομεν. *Hæres.* lxxiv. §. 14. [vol. i. p. 904 B.] 'Agnoscamus verbi ipsius privilegium. Credere illi quilibet potest hominum; credere vere in illum, soli debere te majestati noveris. Sed et hoc ipsum aliud est, *Deum credere*, aliud est *credere in Deum*. Esse Deum et diabolus credere dicitur, secundum Apostolum; *Nam et dæmones credunt et contremiscunt*.—In Deum ergo credere, hoc est fideliter eum quærere, est tota in eum dilectione transire. Credo ergo in illum, hoc est dicere, confiteor illum, colo illum, adoro illum, totum me in jus ejus ac dominium trado, atque transfundo. In professionis hujus reverentia, universa divino nomini debita continentur obsequia.' *Paschasius in Præfat. Operis de Spiritu S.* [p. 734 D.]

intrinsecal sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that holiness, and communication of the effects thereof; and in this communication his office doth consist. Whatsoever therefore doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsecal sanctity which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his nature; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity may be described in his office; and consequently more cannot be necessary than to declare what is the nature, what the office, of the Spirit of God.

For the better indagation of the nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees; which as they will render the discourse more clear, so will they also make the reasons more strong, and the arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God, it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it; for although the Sadducees seemed to deny it, who *said that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit;* though it hath been ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost[14], yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more than that they denied the existence of God, who is a spirit; nor did the notion which the Jews had of the Spirit of God any way incline the Sadducees, who denied the existence of the angels and the souls of men, to reject it. The resurrection, angel, and spirit, which the Sadducees refused to acknowledge, were but two particulars; for it is expressly added, that the *Pharisees confessed both*; of which two the resurrection was one, angels and spirits were the other[15]; wherefore that which the Sadducees disbelieved was the existence of such created spiritual natures, as the angels and the souls of men are conceived to have. And as for those Disciples at Ephesus, who had *not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;* if they were Gentiles, it is no wonder, because they never had that notion in their religion; if they were Jews, as they seem to be,

Acts xxiii. 8.

Acts xix. 2.

[14] As Epiphanius, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον οὐκ ἴσασιν· *Hæres.* xiv. and Gregory Nazianzen: Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Σαδδουκαῖοι μὲν οὐδὲ εἶναι τὸ παράπαν ἐνόμισαν (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀγγέλους, οὐδὲ ἀνάστασιν,) οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν τὰς τοσαύτας περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ διαπτύσαντες. *Orat.* 37. [Orat. xxxi. §. 5. vol. i. p. 558 E.]

[15] Φαρισαῖοι δὲ, φησὶν, ὁμολογοῦσι τὰ ἀμφότερα· καὶ μὴν τρία ἐστί· πῶς οὖν λέγει ἀμφότερα; ἢ ὅτι πνεῦμα καὶ ἄγγελος ἓν ἐστι. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. XLIX. §. 1. vol. ix. p. 364 D.]

because they were baptized with the baptism of John, it signifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but only that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the Apostle mentioned: as we read elsewhere, that *the Holy Ghost was not yet;* not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For, whatsoever the nature of the Spirit of God may be thought to be, no man can conceive the Apostle should deny his existence before Christ's glorification, whose operation was so manifest at his conception. Howsoever, the Apostle asked those ignorant Disciples, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* intimating, that if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ, they could not be ignorant that there is an Holy Ghost; because the Apostles were commanded to *baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* It is therefore presumed that every one who professeth the name of Christ, from the first baptismal institution, acknowledgeth that there is an Holy Ghost: and the only question consists in this, What that Holy Ghost is, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom, according to our baptism, we profess in the Creed to believe?

John vii. 39.

Matt. xxviii. 19.

In order to the determination of which question, our first assertion is, That the Holy Ghost, described to us in the word of God, and joined with the Father and the Son in the form of 309
baptism, is a Person. We are all baptized in the name of three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the public confession of our faith hath relation to those three. We all confess that two of these, the Father and the Son, are Persons; that which we now assert is only this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a Person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence[16]. If we con-

16 To conclude the nature of the Holy Ghost, which is not so immediately expressed in the Scriptures, it will be needful so to place our assertions, as that they may occur to all other misconceptions. Now the old notions (and more they cannot now have) were thus delivered by Gregory Nazianzen, that great divine, so much concerned in this subject: Τῶν δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν τοῦτο [τὸ Πνεῦμα] ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κτίσμα, οἱ δὲ Θεὸν, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὁπότερον τούτων, αἰδοῖ τῆς γραφῆς, ὥς φασιν, ὡς οὐδέτερον σαφῶς δηλωσάσης. [Orat. xxxi. §. 5. vol. i. p. 559 A.] These were the three particular and opposite opinions, either the Spirit is an operation, or a created substance, or God; the fourth is but a doubt or hesitation which of the three is true. The first of these is thus propounded by way of question: Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἢ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑφεστηκότων πάντως ὑποθετέον, ἢ τῶν ἐν ἑτέρῳ θεωρουμένων, ὧν τὸ μὲν οὐσίαν καλοῦσιν οἱ περὶ ταῦτα δεινοὶ, τὸ δὲ συμβεβηκός. *Orat.* 37. [Ibid. §. 6. p. 559 D.] Either it is subsisting in itself, as a substance; or in another, as an

ceive it is an operation only, then must it only be actuated and not act; and when it is not actuated, it must not be at all[17]. If we say that it is a quality, and not a substance; we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable, that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is any thing operative in the world beside substantial beings: and consequently, if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness. By what reason in nature can they be assured, by what revelation in Scripture can they be confident, that there is a reality deserving the name of quality distinguished from all substance, and yet working real and admirable effects? If there were no other argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian faith, that there is an Holy Ghost existing; and we cannot be assured, either by reason or faith, that there is a quality really and essentially distinguished from all substance, it would be sufficient to deter us from that boldness, to assert the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered him as a Person. It is indeed to be observed, that in the Scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a Person, as the adversaries confess: others, which are not properly and primarily to be attributed to a person, as we cannot deny: and it might seem to be equally doubtful, in relation to the Scripture expressions, whether the Holy Ghost were a Person or no; and that they which deny his Personality may pretend as much Scripture as they which assert it. But in this seeming indifferency we must also observe a large diversity; inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is not always taken in the same propriety of signification; nor do we say that the Holy Ghost, which signifieth a Person, always signifieth so much. It is therefore easily

accident. This was the first question then, and still is.

17 This is the argument of the same Father, Εἰ μὲν οὖν συμβέβηκεν, ἐνέργεια τοῦτο ἂν εἴη Θεοῦ· τί γὰρ ἕτερον, ἢ τίνος; τοῦτο γάρπως μᾶλλον, καὶ φεύγει σύνθεσιν· καὶ εἰ ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργηθήσεται δηλονότι, οὐκ ἐνεργήσει, καὶ ὁμοῦ τῷ ἐνεργηθῆναι, παύσεται· τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἐνέργεια. Πῶς οὖν ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ τάδε λέγει, καὶ ἀφορίζει, καὶ λυπεῖται, καὶ παροξύνεται, καὶ ὅσα κινουμένου σαφῶς ἐστιν, οὐ κινήσεως; *Orat.* 37. [Ibid. p. 559 D.]

conceived how some things may be attributed to the Spirit in the Scriptures which are not proper to a Person, and yet the Spirit be a Person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is not a Person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever any thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost as to a Person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a Person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. This therefore we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate: first, that the Scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a Person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be spoken of the Spirit of God any other way than as of a person: secondly, that whatsoever attri- 310
butes or expressions are used in the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant as is objected; or if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifies not a Person.

First then, the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God, is clearly and formally opposed to those evil spirits, which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spiritual and intellectual subsist-
1 Sam. xvi. 14. ence. As, *The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him.* Now, what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of Ahab,
2 Chr. xviii. 20, 21. concerning whom we read, *There came out a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him: and the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets: and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; go out, and do even so.* From whence it is evident, that the evil spirits from God were certain persons, even bad angels, to which the one good Spirit as a Person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again, the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signs of a Person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable Persons; and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged Persons.
Eph. iv. 30. We are exhorted by the Apostle *not to grieve the Spirit of God;* and grief is certainly a personal affection, of which a quality
Rom. viii. 26. is not capable. We are assured that the same *Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered;* and

we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personal: for he *searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God;* and so he knoweth all things, *even the things of God;* which can be no description of the power of God: he *worketh all* the spiritual gifts, *dividing to every man severally as he will;* in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a Person. He revealeth the will of God, and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a Person; for *the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them:* and *the Holy Ghost said* unto the prophets and teachers at Antioch, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.* We cannot better understand the nature of the Holy Ghost than by the description given by Christ which sent him: and he said thus to his Disciples, *The Comforter,* (or, *the Advocate,*) *which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things; he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world,* and *he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a Person, a Person hearing, a Person receiving, a Person testifying, a Person speaking, a Person reproving, a Person instructing.

1 Cor. ii. 10, 12. 1 Cor. xii. 11. Acts x. 19, 20. Acts xiii. 2. John xiv. 26. xv. 26, 27. xvi. 7, 8. Verse 13. Verse 14.

The adversaries to this truth[18], acknowledging all these personal expressions, answer, that it is ordinary in the Scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given

11

[18] The present adversaries to this truth are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus first delivered by Socinus; 'Quod in testimoniis sacris, quæ adversarii citant, Spiritui Sancto actiones tribuuntur, et ea quæ personarum sunt propria; ex hoc nihil concludi potest, cum aliis rebus, quas personas non esse constat, similiter in Scripturis sacris actiones tribuantur, et ea quæ sunt propria personarum. Cujus rei plenissimam fidem facere potest vel locus ille Pauli, 1 Cor. xiii. a ver. 4. usque ad 8. ubi perpetuo de charitate, tanquam de persona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens, quæ revera non nisi in personam cadunt.' *F. Socin. Resp. ad Wiek. cap.* 10. [p. 620.]

unto those things which are no persons: as when the Apostle
1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5, 6, 7. saith, *Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which personal actions are attributed to charity, which is no person, as in other cases it is usual[19], but belonging to that person which is charitable; because that person which is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, say they[20], personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no Person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because that God the Father is a Person, and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself,
Acts x. 19, 20. which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read, *The Spirit said unto Peter, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them:* we must understand that God the Father was the Person which spake those words, and which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, the Holy Ghost said unto those at
Acts xiii. 2. Antioch, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto*

19 So the Racovian Catechism doth enlarge this answer, stating the question thus; 'Qui vero ii Scripturæ loci accipiendi sunt in quibus Spiritui Sancto actiones personarum propriæ et ad Deum ipsum spectantes attribuuntur?' And returning this solution; 'Ad eum modum, quo in Scripturis rebus id attribuatur sæpenumero, quod personarum est; neque tamen res illæ propterea personæ censentur, ut peccato, quod *deceperit*, et *occiderit*, Rom. vii. 11. et Legi, quod *loquatur*, Rom. iii. 19. et Scripturæ quod *prospiciat* et *prænunciet*, Gal. iii. 8. et charitati quod sit *longanimis*, &c. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique spiritui, i. e. vento, quod *spiret ubi velit*.' [Sect. vi.] *cap.* 6. [p. 167.] *Vide Socini Epist.* 3. *ad Petrum Statorium.* [vol. i. p. 435.]

20 'Quod si quis dixerit, satis constare Paulum eo in loco figurate loqui, et charitatis nomine eum intelligere qui charitate sit præditus, quatenus ea est præditus; respondebo, cum Spiritus Sanctus sit Spiritus Dei, certumque sit alioqui spiritum alicujus personæ non posse esse personam ab ea, cujus est spiritus, distinctam, non minus constare cum Spiritui Sancto ea tribuuntur, quæ personæ et simul ipsius Dei sunt propria, nihil aliud intelligendum nomine Spiritus Sancti esse, quam ipsum Deum spiritu suo, id est, virtute atque efficacia sua, agentem atque operantem.' *F. Socin. Resp. ad Wiek. cap.* 10. [vol. ii. p. 620.] 'Quoniam vero Spiritus Sanctus virtus Dei est, hinc fit ut ea quæ Dei sunt, Spiritui Sancto attribuantur, et sub nomine Spiritus Sancti sæpe Deus ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deus per spiritum suum exerit.' *Catech. Racov. ibid. cap.* 6. [p. 167.]

I have called them, we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called Barnabas and Saul, and to whom they were to be separated: but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the sum of their answer; and more than this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a Person.

But this answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the argument. For if all the personal actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the Person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory: but if these actions be personal, as they are acknowledged, and cannot be denied; if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose Spirit it is; if he cannot be said to do that by the power within him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost; then is that defence not to be defended, then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a Person. But I shall clearly prove, that there are several personal attributes given in the sacred Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father; which God the Father, by that
312 power which is in him, cannot be said to do; and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a Person.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.* But to make intercession is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no prosopopœia; the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of intercession for that reason, because it is the Spirit of that Person which intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personal action; and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come, being sent; *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send you from the Father*, saith Christ: and again, *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him to you.* But to come unto men, as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God

Rom. viii. 27.

John xv. 26. xvi. 7.

the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son (*whom the Father will send in my name*, saith our Saviour). When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personal action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a prosopopœia, by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to do it. To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father. *When he*, saith Christ, *the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak.* Now to speak, and not of himself, cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doth all things of himself: to speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorify him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost, *He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you*, is by no means applicable to the Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost is therefore said to do these personal actions, because that Person whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions, by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth therefore that the answer given by the adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

John xiv. 26.

John xvi. 13.

John xvi. 14.

I thought this discourse had fully destroyed the Socinian prosopopœia; and indeed, as they ordinarily propound their answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I find the subtilty of Socinus prepared another explication of the prosopopœia[21], to

21 'Credo me satis ostendisse, Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam, non magis quam aliæ vel proprietates, vel effecta Dei, sint personæ; cum nihil sit aliud quam peculiaris quædam virtus et efficacia Dei: quæ si, ut ipsius Dei proprietas, et vis per quam agit, consideratur et accipitur, figuræ metonymiæ aut prosopopœiæ accommodatissimus est locus: et metonymiæ quidem, si Spiritus Sancti nomine ipse Deus, cujus est spiritus, quique per eum agit, significetur: prosopopœiæ vero, ut quando Deus per Spiritum Sanctum agit, ipsi Spiritui Sancto Dei actio tribuatur: sin autem hæc virtus et efficacia Dei consideratur et accipitur ut res in quibus agit, ab ipsa afficiuntur; utrique isti figuræ similiter aptissimus est locus: quandoquidem commodissime per metonymiam

supply the room where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double figure he groundeth upon this distinction: The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in which it worketh; and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

313 So that now we must not only shew that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father: and this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already shewed cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an Apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send St. Peter an advocate to St. Peter; and St. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son, did come unto St. Peter. Again, our Saviour, speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, *He shall receive of mine:* John xvi. 14. therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is not taken for the Father; *and shew it unto you,* therefore he is not taken for an Apostle: in that he *receiveth,* the first Socinian prosopopœia is improper; in that he *sheweth* to the Apostles, the second is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a Person distinct from the Person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct from the Person of the Apostle in whom he worketh, and consequently neither of the Socinian figures can evacuate or enervate the doctrine of his proper and peculiar Personality.

Secondly, For those attributes or expressions used of the Holy

is qui a Spiritu Sancto aliquo modo affectus quidpiam agit, quatenus id agit, Spiritus Sanctus seu Spiritus Dei metonymice dici potest; ut factum est apud Paulum, cum ait (1 Cor. ii. 10.) *Spiritum* (sub. *Dei*) *omnia scrutari etiam profunda Dei:* ubi Spiritus Dei nomine sine dubio intellexit hominem Spiritu Dei præditum, quatenus, viz. ab isto Spiritu afficitur.—Jam per prosopopœiam ipsi Spiritui Sancto actionem tribui, quæ ipsius Spiritus ope ab homine fiat, adeo est proclive ut nihil magis.' *F. Socin. Resp. ad Wiek. cap.* 10. [vol. ii. p. 621.]

Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a Person, either they are not so repugnant, or, if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifieth not the Person, but the gifts or effects, of the Spirit. They tell us that the Spirit is given, and that sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure; that the Spirit is poured out, and that men do drink of it, and are filled with it; that it is doubled and distributed, and something is taken from it; and that sometimes it is extinguished: and from hence they gather, that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, because these expressions are inconsistent with personality[22]. But a satisfactory answer is easily returned
Acts v. 32. to this objection. It is true, that God is said to have *given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him,* but it is as true that a Person
Isa. ix. 6. may be given; so we read in the Prophet Isaiah, *Unto us a Son*
John iii. 16. *is given;* and we are assured that *God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son,* and certainly the Son of God is a Person. And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a Person; yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in the Scriptures the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of those operations. And being to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already shewn those attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but a Person, we therefore conclude against the Socinians and the Jews[23], that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a Person; which is our first assertion.

22 'Spiritum Sanctum non esse in Deitate personam hinc discere potes; primum quod ea quæ Spiritui Sancto in Scripturis attribuuntur, nulla prorsus ratione personæ conveniant, ut sunt quod detur, quod ex eo detur, idque aut secundum mensuram, aut absque omni mensura, quod effundatur ipse et ex ipso effundatur, et quod eo potentur homines, quod augeatur, quod in duplo detur, in partes distribuatur, tollatur ipse, et ex ipso tollatur;—et similia in Scripturis extant.' *Catech. Racov. cap.* 6. *quæst.* 12. [p. 165.]

23 The opinion of the Jews was, that the Holy Ghost was nothing else but the *afflatus* or energy of God; and therefore they which denied the substantiality of the Spirit were looked upon as symbolizing with the Jews in this particular. 'Lactantius in libris suis, et maxime in epistolis ad Demetrianum, Spiritus Sancti omnino negat substantiam; et errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel Filium, et sanctificationem utriusque personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 65. [Epist. LXXXIV. §. 7. vol. i. p. 524 C.] Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the opinion of the Jews, who delivering the several significations of רוח maketh the fifth and sixth to be these: 'Quinto significat influentiam illam intellectualem divinam a Deo prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute prophetant. Sexto significant propositum, et voluntatem.' And then concludes, 'Vox hæc רוח quando Deo attribuitur, ubique sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatione, quatenus voluntatem significat.' *More Nevochim, p.* i. *cap.* 40.

314 Our second assertion is, That the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, Person. And for the proof of this assertion, we shall first make use of that argument which our adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God, is not a created Person: but the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God which is in God, and therefore not a created Person. This argument is raised from those words of the Apostle, *For who knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost, I find denied by none: that the same Spirit is in God, appeareth by the Apostle's discourse, and is granted by the Socinians[24]: that it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth therefore undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created Person; inasmuch as that cannot be a created Person which hath not a created nature; and that can neither have nor be a created nature, which by nature is in God. Wherefore although it be replied by others, that it is not said in the text that the

1 Cor. ii. 11.

24 The Socinians, endeavouring to prove from this place that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, lay the foundation of their argument in this, that he is the Spirit of God, and by nature in God, so that those things which are proper to the divine nature are attributed and belong to him, and because there is another Person in the divine essence, and, as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a person. 'Deinde idem (sc. Spiritum Sanctum non esse Personam) ex eo patet, quod non sit extra Deum natura sed in ipso Deo. Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisset Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco, 1 Cor. ii. 11. ubi ait, *Quis hominum novit quæ sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui est in homine? Ita quæ sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei.* Quoniam vero Spiritus Sanctus in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu Sancto reciproce dici potest esse Deum, hinc apparet Spiritum Sanctum non esse Personam. Præterea cum superius demonstratum sit unam tantum esse in Deitate personam, et Spiritus Sanctus Dei virtus sit; ut verba Christi ad Apostolos indicant, Luc. xxiv. 49. efficitur Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam divinam. Denique si Spiritus Sanctus esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam eum habere oporteret. Nam ea attribuuntur illi quæ propria sunt essentiæ divinæ: at superius docuimus substantiam divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quamobrem Spiritum non esse Deitatis personam planum est.' *Catech. Racov. cap.* 6. [p. 166.] To the same purpose doth Socinus argue against Wiekus, that the nature of the Spirit is the nature of God, and that the Spirit cannot therefore be a Person, because there can be but one Person in the nature of God. Whereas therefore independently from this place we have proved, that the Holy Spirit is a Person; and from this place have inferred with them, that the same Spirit is in God, and of the divine nature, it followeth, that he is no created Spirit, inasmuch as nothing in the divine nature can be created.

Spirit is in God, yet our adversaries' reason overweighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not expressed, which must be acknowledged to be understood. The Holy Ghost then is a Person (as I have proved), and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God (as is confessed, and only denied to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied), therefore he is no created Person.

Secondly, The Holy Ghost is such a one as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no Person, we could not commit that sin against him; and if he were a created Person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a Person, and that uncreated. The argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, *All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.* By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father, or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it, beyond other sins and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no Person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a Person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies[25].

Matt. xii. 31, 32.

To this they answer, That the sin against the Holy Ghost 315
is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not to our purpose; but they do not, cannot shew that it can be unpardonable, if he were not God. It is not therefore simply, and for no other reason, unpardonable, because that Person is God, against whom it is committed; for if so, then any sin committed against any person which is God, would be unpardonable; which is false. But that sin, which is particularly called the

25 'Quomodo audent inter omnia numerare Spiritum Sanctum, quando ipse Dominus dixit, *Qui blasphemaverit in Filium hominis, remittetur ei; qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum, nec hic, nec in futurum remittetur ei.* Quomodo igitur inter creaturas audet quisquam Spiritum computare? Aut quis sic se obligat, ut si creaturæ derogaverit, non putet sibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum?' *S. Ambros. de Spiritu S. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [§. 53. vol. ii. p. 611 A.]

blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is a sin against God, and in such a manner aggravated, as makes it irremissible; of which aggravation it were uncapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly, Every created Person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as Man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is he now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created Person. *All things were made* John i. 3. *by the Word, and without him was not any thing made that was made;* therefore every created Person was made by the Word. God *hath put all things under the feet* of Christ; *and when he* 1 Cor. xv. *saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is* 27. *excepted which did put all things under him:* and being none is excepted beside God, every created person must be under the feet of the Son of man. But the Spirit of God *in the beginning* was not made, yea rather in the beginning made the world[26], as Job speaks of God, *By his Spirit he hath garnished the* Job xxvi. *heavens:* nor is he under the feet of Christ, now set down at [13]. the right hand of God, who with supreme authority, together

26 Those which anciently did believe the Spirit of God to be a created person, did also teach that he was made by the Son, as Epiphanius testifieth of the Arians; Παντὶ τοῦτο δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὁμολογοῦσι τοὺς ἀγγέλους ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεγονέναι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημοῦσι, καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κεκτίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. *Hæres.* lxix. §. 52. [vol. i. p. 773 D.] 'Ariani ab Ario, in eo sunt notissimi errore, quo Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum nolunt esse unius ejusdemque naturæ,—sed esse Filium creaturam, Spiritum vero Sanctum creaturam creaturæ, hoc est, ab ipso Filio creatum volunt.' *S. August. Hæres.* 49. [vol. viii. p. 18 A.] As Eusebius; Τὸ δὲ παράκλητον Πνεῦμα, οὔτε Θεὸς, οὔτε Υἱός· ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν γένεσιν εἴληφεν· ἓν δέ τι τῶν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γενομένων τυγχάνει, ὅτι δὲ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. *De Eccles. Theol. lib.* iii. *cap.* 6. [p. 175 A.] Ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς μόνος, πατρικῇ θεότητι τετιμημένος, ποιητικὸς ἂν εἴη καὶ δημιουργικὸς τῆς τῶν γενητῶν ἁπάντων, ὁρατών τε καὶ ἀοράτων, καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ παρακλήτου Πνεύματος ὑπάρξεως· πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. *Ibid.* [p. 174 C.] Where it is worth our observation, that Eusebius citing the place of St. John, to prove that the Holy Ghost was made by the Son, leaves out those words twice together by which the Catholics used to refute that heresy of the Arians, viz. ὃ γέγονεν. All things which were made, were made by the Son, but the Holy Ghost was not amongst them, ἃ *γέγονεν, which were made,* and therefore was not made by the Son. Τὸ ἅγιον γὰρ Πνεῦμα κτίσμα πάλιν κτίσματός φασιν εἶναι, διὰ τὸ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὰ πάντα γεγενῆσθαι, ὡς εἶπεν ἡ γραφὴ, ἀσυνέτως τινὰς διαπράζοντες, οὐ καθὼς εἴρηται τὸ ῥητὸν ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ὑπονοοῦντες, καὶ ἀπὸ ῥητοῦ τὸ καλῶς εἰρημένον κατὰ τὴν κακὴν αὐτῶν ὑπόνοιαν παρερμηνεύοντες· οὐ γὰρ τὸ θεῖον εὐαγγέλιον περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔφη, ἀλλὰ περὶ πάντων τῶν κεκτισμένων, ὅτι εἴ τι κτιστὸν, διὰ τοῦ Λόγου γεγένηται, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου· τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, παρεκτεινομένης τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, ἔχει, ὃ γέγονεν, ἵνα οὕτω γνωσθῇ, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxix. §. 56. [vol. i. p. 770 D.]

with the Father, sent the Prophets; as Isaiah testifieth, saying, Is. xlviii. 16. *Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me;* and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of Barnabas and Saul, and with the same authority giveth all 1 Cor. xii. 11. spiritual gifts, *dividing to every man severally as he will*[27]; so Rom. xv. 19. that in this kingdom of Christ all things are done *by the power of the Spirit of God.*

Fourthly, He, by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, was no created Person: for by virtue of that conception he was called the Son of God; whereas if a creature had been the cause of his conception, he had been in that respect the son of a creature; nay, according to the adversaries' principles, he had taken upon him the nature of angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. For it was an angel that Luke i. 35. said to Mary, (not that an angel, but that) *the Holy Ghost shall* 316 *come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* Therefore the Spirit of God is no created Person; which is our second assertion against the ancient, but newly revived heresy of the Arians and Macedonians[28].

27 Ταῦτα πάντα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. Καθὼς βούλεταί φησιν, οὐ καθὼς προστάττεται· διαιροῦν, οὐ διαιρούμενον· αὐθεντοῦν, οὐκ αὐθεντίᾳ ὑποκείμενον· τὴν γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἥνπερ ἐμαρτύρησε τῷ Πατρὶ, ταύτην καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἀνατίθησιν ὁ Παῦλος· καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πατρός φησιν, Ὁ δὲ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα, φησὶν, ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται· εἴδες ἀπηρτισμένην ἐξουσίαν; ὧν γὰρ ἡ οὐσία μία, δῆλον καὶ ὅτι ἡ αὐθεντία μία· καὶ ὧν ἰσότιμος ἡ ἀξία, τούτων καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία. *S. Chrysost. de Sanct. Pentecoste Homil.* 2. [§. 1. vol. ii. p. 469 D.]

28 This express notion of the Spirit of God, that he was a Person, as a ministering Spirit, and created, was acknowledged the doctrine of the Arians, as may appear out of the former testimonies, and is evident by those which followed his opinions. Which being of two kinds, the Anomeans, or pure Arians, (such as were Aetius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius,) and the Homoiousians or Semi-Arians, (such as Eusebius and Macedonius,) they both alike denied the Divinity, and asserted the creation, of the Holy Ghost. The opinion of the Anomeans is clear out of the words of Eunomius, who very subtilly delivered it, as if it had been the opinion of the ancients;—Τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ἐν ἅπασι φυλάσσοντας διδασκαλίαν, παρ' ὧν τρίτον αὐτὸ ἀξιώματι καὶ τάξει μαθόντες, τρίτον εἶναι καὶ τῇ φύσει πεπιστεύκαμεν. [Basil. cont. Eunom. III. vol. i. p. 271 D.] The confession of the ancients was, that the Holy Ghost was the third Person in the Trinity in order and dignity; and Eunomius pretending to follow them, added, that he was also third in nature; which the ancients never taught. And what this third in nature was, he thus declared: Τρίτον τάξει καὶ φύσει, προστάγματι μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐνεργείᾳ δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γενόμενον· τρίτῃ χώρᾳ τιμώμενον, ὡς

Our third assertion is that which necessarily followeth from the former two, that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if he be a Person, as we have proved in the declaration of our first assertion; if he be a Person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second assertion; then must he of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence

πρῶτον καὶ μεῖζον ἁπάντων, καὶ μόνον τοιοῦτον τοῦ μονογενοῦς ποίημα, θεότητος καὶ δημιουργικῆς δυνάμεως ἀπολειπόμενον. [ib. §. 5. p. 276 C.] And again, Εἰ μὴ κτίσμα ἐστὶν, οὐκοῦν γέννημα, ἢ ἀγέννητον· εἷς δὲ ἄναρχος Θεὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος· οὔτε μὴν γέννημα· λείπεται οὖν κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα αὐτὸ ὀνομάζεσθαι. *Apud S. Basil. adv. Eunom. lib.* iii. [§. 6. p. 277 A.] So Gregory Nyssen repeats the words of the same Eunomius: Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Παράκλητον,—γενόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, and declares that their ordinary language was ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κτίσμα κτίσματος καὶ ἔργον ἔργου ὀνομάζειν. *Orat.* i. *cont. Eunom.* [Orat. ii. vol. ii. pp. 486 A. 487 C.] Beside these, the Semi-Arians, and some of those which were orthodox as to the Divinity of the Son, were of the same heresy as to the nature of the Holy Ghost, and therefore were called Πνευματομάχοι (as Epiphanius derives them in the description of that heresy, ἀπὸ Ἡμιαρείων καὶ ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξων. *Hæres.* lxxiv. §. 1. [vol. i. p. 886 D.]) and afterward *Macedoniani*. 'Macedoniani sunt a Macedonio, Constantinopolitanæ Ecclesiæ Episcopo, quos et Πνευματομάχους Græci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigent. Nam de Patre ad Filio recte sentiunt, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiæ vel essentiæ, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes.' *S. August. Hæres.* 52. [vol. viii. p. 18 D.] This heresy was first condemned by the Council of Alexandria; Ἔνθα τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα θεολογήσαντες, τῇ ὁμοουσίῳ τριάδι συνανελαμβάνοντο. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* iii. *cap.* 7. [p. 178.] Afterward by the Council held in Illyricum; Ἡμεῖς δὲ φρονοῦμεν ὡς καὶ αἱ σύνοδοι νῦν ἥ τε κατὰ Ῥώμην καὶ ἡ κατὰ Γαλλίαν, μίαν εἶναι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις, τουτέστιν, ἐν τρισὶ τελείαις ὑποστάσεσιν. *Apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib.* iv. *cap.* 8. [p. 156.] The Synod held at Rome with the Gallican bishops under Damasus: Ὥστε τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν μιᾶς οὐσίας, μιᾶς θεότητος, μιᾶς ἀρετῆς, μιᾶς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἑνὸς χαρακτῆρος πιστεύεσθαι χρὴ, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. *Apud eund. lib.* ii. *cap.* 22. [p. 103.] Another Synod held under the same Damasus at Rome; Εἴ τις εἴποι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποίημα, ἢ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. *Apud eund. lib.* v. *cap.* 11. [p. 211.] After, and upon these particular Synods, this heresy was fully condemned in the second general Council held at Constantinople, in which these words were added to the Nicene Creed, Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ σὺν Πατρὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. [Mansi iii. p. 565 B.] And in the first Canon mentioning the heresies condemned expressly by the Council, they name ἰδικῶς τὴν τῶν Εὐνομιανῶν, εἴτουν Ἀνομοίων, καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν, εἴτουν Εὐδοξιανῶν, καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἡμιαρειανῶν, ἤγουν Πνευματομάχων. [Ib. p. 560 A.] And thus the heresy of Macedonius, who made the Holy Ghost a created person, was condemned by the second general Council; Οὗτος δὴ οὖν ὁ ἱεροφάντης χορὸς Μακεδόνιόν τινα, τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον ἅρπαγμα πάλαι ποιησάμενον, ὅτι τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ζωαρχικὸν ἐδυσφήμει Πνεῦμα, εὐθύνας ἐδικαίου δοῦναι· ὡς γὰρ Ἄρειος κατὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς κατὰ παναγίου παρατατόμενος Πνεύματος, εἰς δούλους καὶ ὑπηρέτας τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ὑπερκειμένην αὐτοῦ συνέταττε κυριότητα. *Phot. Epist.* i. [p. 6.]

of the one eternal God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third assertion, that it is not proved only by the two precedent assertions, but also by the adversaries of them both. He which denies the first, that is the Socinian, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternal and omnipotent power of God; he which denies the second, that is the Macedonian, asserts that he is a Person of an intellectual nature subsisting; but whatsoever is a Person subsisting of eternal and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether therefore we look upon the truth of our assertions, or whether we consider the happiness of their negations, the conclusion is, that the Holy Ghost is God.

But were there nothing, which is already said, demonstrated, there is enough written in the word of God to assure us of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, to make us undoubtingly believe that
Ex. xxxiv. 34. the Spirit of God is God. It is written by Moses, that *when he went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out.* And that Lord with whom Moses spake was the one Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth. But we are assured that the Spirit was and is that Lord to which Moses 317
spake; for the Apostle hath taught us so much by his own
2 Cor. iii. 15, 16, 17. interpretation, saying, *Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit.* The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the one eternal God, that the adversaries of this truth must either deny that *the Lord* is here to be taken for God, or that *the Spirit* is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denials must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainness of the Apostle's discourse.

But indeed they are so ready to deny any thing, that they will by no means acknowledge either the one or the other: but *the Lord* must be something which is not God, and *the Spirit* must be something which is not the Spirit of God: and then they conclude the argument is of no force, and may as well conclude the Apostle's interpretation hath no sense. *The Lord,* they say, is Christ, and not God; for Christ, they say, is not God: *the Spirit,* they say, is the mystery of the Law, or the hidden sense of it, and that every one knows is not the Spirit of God. But we are assured that the Apostle did mean by *the Spirit,* the Spirit of God, not the sense of the Law; for he

addeth immediately, *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;* and the sense of the Law is never called the Spirit of the Lord. Nay, were it not that the coherence of the discourse did satisfy us; yet the objection ought not at all to move us: for the name of *Spirit* in those places mentioned by them to signify *the sense of the Law* hath no affinity with this, according to their own way of argumentation: for it is never so taken with the emphasis of an article, and put in the place either of an entire subject or a predicate in a proposition[29], except by way of opposition; and one of those it must of necessity be in those words of the Apostle, *now the Lord is that Spirit,* and that without the least intimation of any opposition.

Again, we are assured that by *the Lord* the Apostle did understand the eternal God; for he speaketh of the same Lord which he mentioned in the verse before, and that is the Lord God spoken of in the book of Exodus; of which except the Apostle speaks, his argument hath neither inference nor coherence. In vain therefore is this pretended for an answer, that the Apostle by *the Lord* doth always, unless he cite some place out of the old covenant, understand Christ; for in this particular he citeth a certain place out of the book of Exodus[30], and useth the name of the *Lord* in the same notion in which there it is used, framing an argument and urging it from thence; and if

29 The places alleged by them are these; Περιτομὴ καρδίας, ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. Rom. ii. 29. Ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. Rom. vii. 6. Ἥτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος. Rev. xi. 8. One of these places speaks only adverbially; the other two have πνεῦμα *in obliquo;* and one of those two has it *cum adjuncto,* both of them *cum opposito,* none of them *cum articulo,* none of them are *in loco subjecti* or *prædicati;* and therefore how any of these can shew, that τὸ πνεῦμα in this place by us urged, invested with an article, standing in the place either of a complete subject or a complete predicate, with nothing adjoined, nothing opposed unto it, must be taken in the same sense with them, I cannot imagine. In the sixth verse of this chapter indeed (2 Cor. iii.) it is the subject of a proposition, and invested with an article; but that is an article of opposition, Τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, and this not. Howsoever, in that sense objected, it neither agrees with the words before it, nor with those which follow it.

30 The words in Exodus were these, xxxiv. 34. Ἡνίκα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωϋσῆς ἔναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιῃρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα· which are thus made use of by the Apostle; Ἡνίκα δ' ἂν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. 2 Cor. iii. 16. Κύριος then is here used by St. Paul, citing some place out of the old Covenant, and the words which follow, Ὁ δὲ Κύριος, signify the same Κύριος, as appeareth by the conjunction δέ; and if so, then, according to the doctrine of our adversaries, it cannot signify Christ. For that Lord of whom Moses spake, was then when Moses wrote; but that Christ of which they interpret it, was not then, as they teach; therefore that Lord cannot be Christ, in their interpretation, without a contradiction.

he did not, that rule is not so universal and infallible, but that *the Lord* in the language of the same Apostle may not signify the second, but the first or third Person of the Trinity[31]. If 318 then *the Lord* be the eternal God, as the Apostle without any question understood him in Moses; if *the Spirit* be the Spirit of the Lord, as the Apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following; then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternal God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

Again, the same Scriptures do clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For
Acts v. 3. when Peter said, *Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?* he repeateth the same question in refer-
Verse 4. ence to the same offence, *Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.* To lie unto the Holy Ghost, is to lie unto God: to lie unto the Holy Ghost, is not to lie unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man: and consequently not to lie unto any angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an angel; not to lie unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature; but to lie unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.

To this plain and evident argument there are so many answers, that the very multitude discovers the weakness of them all; for if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First, They

31 For though Christ be most frequently called *our Lord*, yet being God the Father of Christ is our Lord, being ὁ Κύριος is often used by St. Paul without any restriction or intimation of appropriating that act unto the Son, which is attributed to the Lord by him, the rule cannot be certain and universal. For I desire to know by what means they can be assured, that the Apostle doth by the title ὁ Κύριος intend Christ, and not the most high God the Father, in the following places, 1 Cor. iii. 5. iv. 19. vii. 10, 12. xvi. 7. 1 Thess. iv. 6. v. 27. 2 Thess. iii. 1, 5, 16. 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. ii. 7. And beside, I ask how the pretence of this general rule can be properly objected by those who know that they, to whom they do object this rule, have contended that this title is elsewhere attributed to the Holy Ghost. As St. Basil upon that place, 2 Thess. iii. 5. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, thus disputes; Τίς ὁ κατευθύνων Κύριος εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπην, καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπομονήν; ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταδουλούμενοι. Εἴτε γὰρ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὁ λόγος, πάντως ἂν εἴρητο, ὁ δὲ Κύριος ὑμᾶς κατευθύναι εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην· εἴτε περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, προσέκειτο ἄν, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπομονήν· ζητείτωσαν οὖν τί ἐστιν ἄλλο πρόσωπον, ὃ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου τιμᾶσθαι ἄξιον. And upon the like place, 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13. Ποῖον Κύριον εὔχεται ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἀμέμπτους τὰς καρδίας ἑστηριγμένας ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ πιστῶν στηρίξαι; Ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ μετὰ τῶν λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων τῶν πρὸς διακονίαν ἀποστελλομένων (the newly revived opinion clearly) τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τιθέντες· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχουσι. *De Spiritu Sancto, cap.* 21. [vol. iii. p. 44 A, C.]

answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the *Holy Ghost* in the original is put in one case, and *God* in another[32]; and the Apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot shew that the Spirit is God. To which it is easily answered, that the case or manner of the Apostle's speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is; for to deceive the Holy Ghost, is nothing else but to lie unto him, or by a lie to endeavour to deceive him. The act objected to Ananias was but one, which act of his the Apostles looked upon as injurious, not to themselves, but to the Holy Ghost; and therefore St. Peter shewed the sin to be not against men, but against God: as certainly then as the Apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of St. Peter, God.

As for that sense which they put upon the words, different from that of lying to God, as if Ananias were accused for counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of Ananias is again expressed in the case of his wife Sapphira, to whom St. Peter said, *How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* Acts v. 9. But to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two several things; and it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit was nothing else but lying to him: for St. Peter said to Sapphira, *Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much? and she said, Yea, for so much:* in which answer she lied. *Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* viz. in saying that ye sold the land for so much. Here is no colour then for that new pretence, that Ananias did bear the Apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit, and belie the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound St. Peter, but to belie Ananias, and make him guilty of that sin, which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lied, it is also certain that he to whom he lied
519 was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well translated, that he *lied to the Holy Ghost*[33].

[32] 'Ex his facile apparet haudquaquam ex eo loco concludi posse Spiritum Sanctum esse Deum; cum alio modo de Spiritu Sancto loquatur Petrus, alio de Deo. Illic dicit *mentiri* seu *fallere*, ac *ludificari Spiritum Sanctum*, hic *mentiri Deo*.' *Crell. de uno Deo Patre, lib.* i. §. 3. *Argum.* 1. [vol. iv. p. 64.]

[33] Our translation is here accused without reason. For though the original be ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, yet some copies have it, εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα, and

Next, Because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us, though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God: and the reason which they render to justify this negation, is, because there are several places of the Scripture, in which the Messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God, as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they allege those words of the Apostle, *He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given us his Holy Spirit,* I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question: for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, *he therefore that despiseth,* it hath no relation to the present question; and if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, *He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me;* it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which founds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our assertion; first, that they lied to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that in doing so, they lied not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lied unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation. For if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man, it might as well have been said, You lied not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the

1 Thess. iv. 8.

Matt. x. 40. Luke x. 16.

the Syriac did so read and interpret it, דתרגל ברוחא דקודשא the Vulgar Latin to the same purpose, *mentiri te Spiritui Sancto.* And the author of the Tractate de *Temp. Barbarico,* under the name of St. Austin, *mentiri te apud Spiritum Sanctum. Cap.* 3. [vol. vi. p. 609 E.] Now ψεύδεσθαι εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα is the same with τῷ Πνεύματι, as, Μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, *Lie not one to another.* Col. iii. 9. If we read it εἰς Πνεῦμα, then it is rightly translated. Again, if we read it τὸ Πνεῦμα, it has in this case the sense of τῷ Πνεύματι. As Psal. lxvi. 3. יכחשו לך איבך LXX. Ψεύσονταί σε οἱ ἐχθροί σου, of the same sense with that Psal. lxxxi. 15. משנאי יהוה יכחשו־לו, LXX. Οἱ ἐχθροὶ Κυρίου ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ. So Deut. xxxiii. 29. ויכחשו איביך לך LXX. Καὶ ψεύσονταί σε οἱ ἐχθροί σου. And Isa. lvii. 11. כי תכזבי Καὶ ἐψεύσω με. 2 Kings iv. 16. אל־תכזב בשפחתך Μὴ διαψεύσῃ τὴν δούλήν σου. If therefore we read it ψεύσασθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα, it is rightly translated *to lie unto the Holy Ghost;* and so agreeth with that which followeth, *to tempt the Holy Ghost,* as Psal. lxxviii. 36. Τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτῶν ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ, and verse 41. Ἐπέστρεψαν καὶ ἐπείρασαν τὸν Θεόν. Therefore whatsoever shifts are laid upon the phrase, or difference of expression, are either false or frivolous.

Apostle would have aggravated the sin of Ananias with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, Thou hast not lied unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God. But being he first told him plainly his sin, *lying to the Holy Ghost;* and then let him know the sinfulness of it, *thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God:* it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lied is God.

Thirdly, That Person, whose inhabitation maketh a temple, is God; for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God, if to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabitation of any created Person can make a temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, as we are informed by the Apostle, *What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Therefore the Holy Ghost is God. 1 Cor. vi. 19.

To this is replied differently, according to the diversity of our adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tells us, that if we would enforce by this reason that the Holy Ghost is God, we must prove that he is a Person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a Divine
320 right[34]. But we have already proved that he is a Person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary, but that which more confirmeth our assertion; for they urge only those words of the Apostle, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* We do certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God therefore dwelleth in us; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but only because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Person not Divine, or any thing but a Person though Divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us; or if he did, that 1 Cor. iii. 16.

34 'Si quis ex eo, quod corpus nostrum Spiritus Sancti templum sit, concludere velit, eum esse Deum; illi demonstrandum est, ita corpus nostrum Spiritus Sancti templum dici, ut intelligatur, eum esse personam, cujus honori corpus nostrum sit dicatum, et a qua corpus nostrum eo jure, quod divini numinis proprium est, possideatur, ac principaliter incolatur.' *Crell. de uno Deo Patre, lib.* i. §. 3. *Argum.* 1. [p. 64.]

by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but only this, that being the Holy Ghost who possesseth us is a Person, we must shew that our bodies are his by the highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honour; which he therefore conceives we cannot shew, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honour. But it were very strange, if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they which are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honour. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then Christ can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed, if the Apostle had said, as our adversary doth, that we ought
1Cor.vi.20. *with our body to glorify, not the Spirit, but God;* I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God: but being that blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the Apostles, never taught us not to glorify him, I shall rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy, than the assertion of his Deity to be false Divinity. And whereas it is said, that *the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation;* this is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this only notion I am fully confirmed in the belief of my assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us, but by the inhabitation of the Spirit: I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God, but by the inhabitation of God, as it is
2Cor.vi.16. written, *Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people:* and therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost, who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God which dwelleth in us.

Fourthly, He, to whom the Divine attributes do belong as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are Divine attributes which are proprieties of the Divine nature, and consequently none can be endued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the Divine attributes, such as are omniscience, omnipotency, omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father; therefore we are

as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them; and they are so many, that to manage them against the exceptions of the adversaries, would take up too much room in this discourse; especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

321 Fifthly, He, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God: because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are; and therefore if the operations be truly Divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that Person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of creation and conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an exposition, I conclude my third assertion, that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly Divine, the true and living God.

Now being we do firmly believe, that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the Divine essence is incapable of multiplicity; being we have already shewn, that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none; and have also proved, that the only Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same Divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary, for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to shew how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God.

First, Though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father: for the Scriptures do as certainly distinguish them in their

Persons, as they do unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any Person should proceed from himself; but the Holy
John xv. 26. Ghost *proceedeth from the Father,* therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father, and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no Person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father:* therefore he is not the Father.

Secondly, Though we have formerly proved, that the Son of God is properly and truly God; though we now have also proved, that the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son: for he which receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no Person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorify himself by so receiving. But the Comforter,
John xiv. 26. *who is the Holy Ghost,* received of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for so our Saviour expressly
John xvi. 14. said, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.* Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again, he, whose coming depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son, who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure:
John xvi. 7. as he told the Apostles before he departed, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you:* therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly, Though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost be also the same God; yet we are assured that the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son; because 322
the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both
Matt. iii. 16, 17. from the Father and the Son. As, when *the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,* he was manifestly distinguished from the Person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the Person of the Father, who spake from
Eph. ii. 18. heaven of his Son. The Apostle teacheth us, that *through* the Son *we have access by one Spirit unto the Father,* and consequently assureth us, that the Spirit, *by whom,* is not the Father, *to whom,*

nor the Son, *through whom*, we have that access. So *God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons:* and *because* we *are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father;* and when that Comforter is come, *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I conclude therefore against the old Sabellian heresy[35], that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son; which is my fourth assertion.

Gal. iv. 4, 5, 6.

John xiv. 26; xv. 26.

Matt. xxviii. 19.

Our fifth assertion is, That the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the blessed Trinity. For being he is a Person, by our first assertion; a Person not created, by the second; but a Divine Person properly and truly God, by the third; being though he is thus truly God, he is neither the Father, nor the Son, by the fourth assertion, it followeth that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three; so there is also an order, by which, of these Persons, the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third.

35 This heresy indeed was very ancient, even before Sabellius, though those which held it were afterwards all so denominated from Sabellius. For we find it was the opinion of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote; who being urged with that place, where the three persons were distinguished, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God,* Luke i. 35. answered thus, 'Filius Dei Deus est, et virtus Altissimi Altissimus est.' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 26. [p. 515 D.] After Praxeas followed Noëtus μονοτύπως τὸν αὐτὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα—ἡγησάμενος. *Epiph. Hæres.* lvii. §. 2. [vol. i. p. 481 D.] 'Noëtiani a quodam Noëto, qui dicebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum.' *S. August. Hæres.* 36. [vol. viii. p. 11 C.] Suddenly after Noëtus arose Sabellius; Δογματίζει οὗτος, καὶ οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Σαβελλιανοὶ, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· ὡς εἶναι ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς ὀνομασίας. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxii. §. 1. [p. 513 B.] From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called *Sabellians;* 'Sabelliani ab illo Noëto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur; nam et discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses eas Epiphanius computet, nescio; cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noëtiani enim difficile ab aliquo sciuntur; Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum.' *S. August. Hæres.* 41. [vol. viii. p. 11 G.]

Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father, not the Son, is first, and the Son, not the Father, second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son; though therefore this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time; yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father who is the first Person, cannot be the first; receiving the same from the Son, who is the second, cannot be the second; but being from the first and second must be of the three the third. And thus both the 323
number and the order of the Persons are signified together by
1 John v. 7. the Apostle, saying, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.* And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is
Matt. xxviii. 19. expressly mentioned, in the baptismal institution made *in the*
Vide p. 122. [p. 65.] *name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have but briefly spoken, prove that the Holy Ghost is the third[36]; which is our fifth assertion.

Our sixth and last assertion (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes, and operations with the Father and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son, is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father,

[36] So Epiphanius several times calls the Holy Spirit τριτον τῇ ὀνομασίᾳ.

as our Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their Personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath been already shewn to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him. John xv. 26.

Secondly, Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there: because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the language of the Apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* And *we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.* Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son, for *because* we *are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into* our *hearts;* the Spirit of Christ, *Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;* even *the Spirit of Christ which was in* the Prophets; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.* If then the Holy Spirit be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceeded from the Father, it followeth that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son. Matt. x. 20. 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12. Gal. iv. 6. Rom. viii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 11. Phil. i. 19.

Again, Because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath by the original communication a right of mission; as, *the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send:* but the same Spirit which is sent by the Father is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto* John xiv. 26. John xv. 26.

you. Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by 324
the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit; because neither of them received the Divine nature from the Spirit: but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the Divine nature, common to both the Father and the Son, was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As therefore the Scriptures declare expressly, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father; so do they also virtually teach, that he proceedeth from the Son.

From whence it came to pass in the primitive times, that the Latin fathers[37] taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, because by good consequence they did collect so much from those passages of the Scripture which we have used to prove that truth. And the Greek Fathers, though they stuck more closely to the phrase and language of the Scripture, saying, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father,

37 This is not the late but ancient opinion of the Latin Church, as will appear by these testimonies: 'Loqui de eo [Spiritu Sancto] non necesse est, qui Patre et Filio auctoribus confitendus est.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* ii. *cap.* 29. [p. 802 D.] 'Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio.' *S. Ambros. de Sp. S. lib.* i. *cap.* 11. [§. 120. vol. ii. p. 625 D.] 'Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus est, procedens quidem a Patre et Filio; sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque.' *Idem, de Symb. cap.* 3. [vol. i. App. p. 322 D.]

——— *Et in servos cœlestia dona profudit,*
Spiritum ab unigena Sanctum et Patre procedentem.
Paulin. de S. Felice Nat. 9. [Poem. xxvi. vv. 91, 92.]

'Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur.' *S. August. de Trin. lib.* iv. *cap.* 20. [§. 29. vol. viii. p. 829 C.] 'Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites, eundem Spiritum Sanctum qui Patris et Filii unus est Spiritus, de Patre et Filio procedere.' *Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, cap.* 11. [p. 523.]

Qui noster Dominus, qui tuus unicus
Spirat de Patrio corde Paracletum.
Prudent. Cathem. Hymn. V. ver. 159.

'Tanquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus Sanctus nominetur; nec alius sit qui genuit, alius qui genitus est, alius qui de utroque processit;' Leo speaking of the Sabellian heresy, *Epist.* xciii. *cap.* 1. [Ep. xv. vol. i. p. 450.] 'Audi manifestius, proprium Patris esse genuisse, et proprium Filii natum fuisse; proprium vero Spiritus Sancti procedere [de Patre Filioque]. *Vigil. cont. Eutych. lib.* i. [c. 11.] By which testimonies, and the like, of the Latin Fathers, we may well guess in which Church the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius first was framed; for as it is confessed to be written first in Latin, so it is most probable that it was composed by some member of the Latin Church, by that expression in it, 'Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.'

and not saying, that he proceedeth from the Son[38]; yet they acknowledged under another Scripture expression the same thing which the Latins understand by procession, viz. That the Spirit is of or from the Son, as he is of and from the Father; and therefore usually when they said, he *proceedeth from the Father*, they also added, he *received of the Son*[39]. The interpretation of which words, according to the Latins, inferred a procession[40]; and that which the Greeks did understand thereby, was the same which the Latins meant by the procession from the Son, that is, the receiving of his essence from him. That as the Son is God of God by being of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is God of God by being of the Father and the Son[41], as receiving that infinite and eternal essence from them both.

38 The ancient Greek Fathers, speaking of this procession, mention the Father only, and never, I think, express the Son, as sticking constantly in this to the language of the Scriptures. Thus Gregory Nazianzen distinguisheth the three Persons; Ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὅρων ἱστάμενοι, τὸ ἀγέννητον εἰσάγομεν, καὶ τὸ γεννητὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. *Orat.* 1. *de Filio.* [Orat. xxix. §. 2. vol. i. p. 524 C.] And the three proprieties attributed to the three Persons are these, ἀγεννησία to the Father, γέννησις to the Son, and ἐκπόρευσις to the Holy Ghost. But this word ἐκπόρευσις, or the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι, was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only as the Scriptures speak, in relation to the Father*.

39 As Epiphanius; Καὶ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημοῦσι, καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κεκτίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἄκτιστον, ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον. *Hæres.* lxix. §. 52. [vol. i. p. 774 A.] Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, ἀεὶ ὂν σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ δὲ Θεοῦ ὄν, ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον. *Idem, Ancor.* §. 6. [vol. ii. p. 11 B.] Ἀεὶ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐ συνάδελφον Πατρὶ, οὐ γεννητὸν, οὐ κτιστὸν, οὐκ ἀδελφὸν Υἱοῦ, οὐκ ἔγγονον Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς δὲ ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον. *Idem, Hæres.* lxii. §. 4. [vol. i. p. 515 C.]

40 'A Filio accipit, qui et ab eo mittitur, et a Patre procedit. Et interrogo utrum id ipsum sit a Filio accipere, quod a Patre procedere. Quod si differre credetur inter accipere a Filio, et a Patre procedere; certe id ipsum atque unum esse existimabitur, a Filio accipere, quod sit accipere a Patre. Ipse enim Dominus ait, *Quoniam de meo accipiet, et annunciabit vobis.*' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* viii. *cap.* 20. [p. 959 B.] So St. Cyril; Ἐπειδὴ [τὸ Πνεῦμα] ὁμοούσιόν τε ἐστὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ πρόεισι θεοπρεπῶς δι' αὐτοῦ, πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐφ' ἅπασι τελεωτάτην ἔχον ἐνέργειάν τε καὶ δύναμιν, διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. *Com. in Joan. lib.* xi. [vol. iv. p. 929 E.] 'De Filio ergo accepit, et omnia quæ habet Pater Filii sunt, quæ Spiritus Sanctus accepit: quia non de solo Patre, nec de solo Filio, sed simul de utroque procedit.' *Fulgent. lib.* vii. *cont. Fab. apud Theodulph. de Sp. S.* [Fragm. xxvii. p. 612.]

41 That this was the sense of the Greek Fathers anciently, who used those two Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, appeareth by Epiphanius, who frequently declares so much; as *in Ancorato*; Πνεῦμα γὰρ Θεοῦ, καὶ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Πνεῦμα Υἱοῦ,——ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τρίτον τῇ ὀνομασίᾳ. §. 8. [vol. ii. p. 13 A.] And speaking of Ananias who lied unto the Spirit; Ἆρα Θεὸς ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ᾧ ἐψεύσαντο οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμήματος νοσφισάμενοι. §. 9

* [This should probably be, "in relation to the Holy Ghost."]

This being thus the general doctrine of the Eastern and the 325
Western Church, differing only in the manner of expression, and that without any opposition, Theodoret[12] gave the first occasion of a difference, making use of the Greeks' expression against the doctrine both of Greeks and Latins; denying that the Holy Ghost receiveth his essence from the Son, because the Scripture saith, he proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But St. Cyril, against whom he

[p. 14 A.] Οὐκ ἀλλότριον Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας, ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος, ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, ἐνυπόστατον ἀεὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. *Idem, Hæres.* lxii. §. 4. [vol. i. p. 515 C.] In these words is plainly contained this truth, That the Spirit is God of God the Father, and of God the Son; and that they did conclude this truth from those two Scriptures, *He proceedeth from the Father,* John xv. 26. and *receiveth of the Son,* xvi. 15. is also evident by these and the like passages; Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς πιστεύεται Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. *Epiph. Ancor.* §. 67. [p. 70 D.] Εἰ τοίνυν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, λήψεται. Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ, οὕτω τολμῶ λέγειν, ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, παρ' οὗ ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ παρ' οὗ λαμβάνει· καὶ οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸν Πατέρα, εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον —ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. *Ibid.* §. 73. [p. 78 B.] '*Non loquetur a semetipso;* hoc est, non sine me, et sine meo et Patris arbitrio; quia inseparabilis a mea et Patris est voluntate: quia non ex se est, sed ex Patre et me est, hoc enim ipsum quod subsistit et loquitur, a Patre et me illi est.' *Didym. de Sp. S. lib.* ii. [c. 34. in S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 142 A.] *Et paulo post;* [143 E, 144 A.] '*Ille me clarificabit,* id est, Paracletus, *quia de meo accipiet.* Rursum hoc, *accipere,* ut divinæ naturæ conveniat intelligendum —— Spiritum Sanctum a Filio accipere, id quod suæ naturæ fuerat cognoscendum est.——. Neque enim quid aliud est Filius, exceptis his quæ ei dantur a Patre; neque alia substantia est Spiritus Sancti præter id quod datur ei a Filio.'

[12] St. Cyril having set forth anathematisms against the heresy of Nestorius, in the ninth anathematism condemned all who did not speak of the Holy Ghost as Ἴδιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα. To which Theodoret returned this answer; Ἴδιον δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφυὲς καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον ἔφη, συνομολογήσομεν, καὶ ὡς εὐσεβῆ δεξόμεθα τὴν φωνήν· εἰ δ' ὡς ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο, καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀπορρίψομεν. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγοντι, Τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται· καὶ τῷ θειοτάτῳ δὲ Παύλῳ ὁμοίως φάσκοντι, Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Theod. vol. iv. p. 718 C.] St. Cyril in his reply takes no great notice of this high charge of impiety and blasphemy, and only answers to the argument so far as it concerned his expression, viz. that the Spirit is Ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ Πνεῦμα, but in this answer makes use of that Scripture, which he and others used to prove that the Spirit had his essence from the Son: Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνὴν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ· πάντα γὰρ ἔχει μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός· καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἐδίδαξεν εἰπὼν περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ Πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. [Cyril. Alex. vol. vi. p. 229 B.] Although therefore St. Cyril doth not go to maintain that which Theodoret denied, and St. Cyril elsewhere teacheth, viz. that the Holy Ghost is from the Son, yet he justified his own position by that Scripture, which by himself and the rest of the Fathers is thought to teach as much.

wrote, taking small notice of this objection; and the writings of Theodoret, in which this was contained, being condemned; there was no sensible difference in the Church, for many years, concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations did arise in the Western Church, till at last the Latins put it into the Constantinopolitan Creed [43]; and being admon-

[43] The second General Council held at Constantinople, finding it necessary to make an addition to the Nicene Creed in the article concerning the Holy Ghost, of which that Council had said no more than this, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, framed this accession against Macedonius, Εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον· [Mansi iii. p. 565 B.] in which they spake most warily, using the words of the Scripture, and the language of the Church, which was so known and public, that it is recorded even by Lucian in his Dialogue called *Philopatris*; §. 12.

Κρι. Καὶ τίνα ἐπομόσομαί γε;

Τρι. Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν, μέγαν, ἄμβροτον, οὐρανίωνα,
Υἱὸν Πατρὸς, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
Ἕν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς τρία·
Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ Θεόν.

This Creed being received by the whole Church of God, and it being added also by the next general Council at Ephesus, that it should not be lawful to make any addition to it, notwithstanding, the question being agitated in the West, 'Utrum Spiritus Sanctus sicut procedit a Patre, ita et procedat a Filio,' and it being concluded in the affirmative, they did not only declare the doctrine to be true, but also added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sang it publicly in their Liturgy. 'Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificatorem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem.' This being first done in the Spanish and French Churches, and the matter being referred to Leo the Third bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated: for in the acts of the Synod held at Aquisgranum, we find it so determined by the Pope, upon the conference with the Legates: 'Ergo, ut video, illud a vestra paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud de quo quæstio agitur de sæpe fato Symbolo tollatur, et tunc demum a quolibet licite ac libere, sive cantando sive tradendo, discatur et doceatur;' so one of the Legates. To which Leo answered thus, 'Ita proculdubio a nostra parte decernitur: ita quoque ut a vestra assentiatur a nobis omnibus modis suadetur.' [Mansi xiv. p. 21 E.] Beside, lest the Roman Church might be accused to join with the Spanish and French Churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed publicly to be set forth in the Church, graven in silver plates, one in Latin, and another in Greek, in the same words in which the Council of Constantinople had first penned it. 'Hic pro amore et cautela orthodoxæ fidei fecit [in B. Petri basilica] scuta argentea duo scripta utraque Symbolo, unum quidem literis Græcis, et alium Latinis, sedentia dextra lævaque super ingressum corporis.' *Anastas. in Vita Leonis* III. [p. 75.] 'Leo tertius [Symboli] transcriptum in tabula argentea, post altare B. Pauli posita, posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, et cautela fidei orthodoxæ. In quo quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus Sancti solus commemoratur Pater his verbis; *Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum vivificatorem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre et Filio co-adorandum et glorificandum.*' *P. Lombardus.* [lib. i. dist. xi.] These were taken out of the archiva at Rome, saith Photius, and so placed by Leo, that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true copies of that Creed not to be altered. Ὁ Θεσπέσιος Λέων καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς θησαυροφυλακίοις τῶν κορυφαίων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ἐκ παλαιοτάτων χρόνων ἀποτεθησαυρισμένας τοῖς ἱεροῖς κειμηλίοις δύο ἀσπίδας, αἳ γράμμασι καὶ ῥή

ished by the Greeks of that, as of an unlawful addition, and refusing to rase it out of the Creed again, it became an occa-

μασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἔλεγον τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς ἡμῶν πίστεως ἔκθεσιν, ταύτας καταναγνωσθῆναι κατενώπιον τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ πλήθους καὶ εἰς ὄψιν ἁπάντων ἐλθεῖν ἐδικαίωσε, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν θεασαμένων τηνικαῦτα καὶ ἀνεγνωκότων ἔτι τῷ βίῳ παραμένουσι. *Phot. apud Nicet. Thes. Orthod. Fid. t.* 21. *ut exscripsit Archiep. Armach.* Οὗτος ὁ Λέων καὶ τὸ θησαυροφυλάκιον τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων ἀνοίξας ἀσπίδας δύο τοῖς ἱεροῖς κειμηλίοις ἀποτεθησαυρισμένας ἐξήνεγκεν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ γράμμασι καὶ ῥήμασιν ἐχούσας τὴν εὐσεβῆ τῆς πίστεως ἔκθεσιν. *Idem, apud Euthym. Panopl. Dogm. tit.* 12. *ab eodem Archiep. exscript.* This was the great and prudent care of Leo the Third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorized by a general Council, and received by the whole Church; and by this means he quieted all distempers for his time. But not long after, the following Popes, more in love with their own authority, than desirous of the peace and unity of the Church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition *Filioque*. This was first done in the time and by the power of Pope Nicolaus the First, who by the activity of Photius was condemned for it. 'Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit Photius ipsum [Nicolaum] fore excommunicatum quod apposuerat ad Symbolum Spiritum Sanctum a Filio procedere. Similiter et depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii.' *Antonin. part* iii. *tit.* 22. *c.* 13. This was it which Photius complained of so highly in his Encyclic Epistle to the archiepiscopal sees of the Eastern Church; Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐχὶ μόνον εἰς ταῦτα παρανομεῖν ἐξηνέχθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴ τις κακῶν ἐστι κορωνὶς, εἰς ταύτην ἀνέδραμον· πρὸς γάρ τοι τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀτοπήμασι, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον σύμβολον, ὃ πᾶσι τοῖς συνοδικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς ψηφίσμασιν ἄμαχον ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν, νόθοις λογισμοῖς, καὶ παρεγγράπτοις λόγοις, καὶ θράσους ὑπερβολῇ, κιβδηλεύειν ἐπεχείρησαν (ὦ τῶν τοῦ πονηροῦ μηχανημάτων), τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνου, ἀλλά γε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι, καινολογήσαντες. *Phot. Epist.* ii. §. 8. [p. 51.] 'Hugo Etherianus legit κενολογήσαντες, dum vertit *frustra profitetur*.' Thus far Photius against Nicolaus before he was deposed. After he was restored again, in the time of Pope John the Eighth, in the eighth General Council, as the Greeks call it, it was declared that the addition of *Filioque*, made in the Creed, should be taken away. Ἐζήτησεν δὲ ἡ Σύνοδος αὕτη καὶ περὶ τῆς προσθήκης τοῦ Συμβόλου, καὶ ἔκρινεν ἄξιον ἵνα ἐξαιρεθῇ παντελῶς, says Marcus bishop of Ephesus, in the Council of Florence. [Mansi xxxi. p. 553 A.] After this the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theophylact, in as high a manner as by Photius. Ἔστιν οὖν τὸ μέγιστον ἐκεῖνο σφάλμα, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τὸ τοῦ Σολομῶντος ᾄδου πεταύρους ποιοῦν συναντᾶν, ἡ ἐν τῷ τῆς πίστεως Συμβόλῳ καινοτομία, ἣν ἐποιήσαντο ἀνακηρύττοντες τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι. *Theoph. ad Joan. cap.* 3. Καὶ τοῖς Δυτικοῖς τοίνυν εἴ τι μὲν περὶ τὸ δόγμα διαμαρτάνεται τὴν πατρικὴν πίστιν σαλεῦον, οἷον δὴ τὸ ἐν τῷ Συμβόλῳ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος προστιθέμενον, ἔνθα ὁ κίνδυνος μέγιστος, τοῦτο μὴ διορθώσεως ἀξιούμενον ὁ συγχωρῶν ἀσυγχώρητος. *Ibid.* Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding *Filioque* to the Creed, contrary to a General Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another Council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, or *Filioque*, are taken out of the Creed. The one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words, and the authority of the Pope to alter any thing; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the authority of the ancient Councils. This therefore is much to be lamented, that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latins

sion of the vast schism between the Eastern and the Western Churches.

326 Now although the addition of words to the formal Creed without the consent, and against the protestation of the Oriental Church, be not justifiable; yet that which was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth; so long as they pretend it not to be a definition of that Council, but an addition or explication inserted, and condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other language than the Scriptures and their Fathers spake.

Howsoever we have sufficiently in our assertions declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, distinguishing him from all qualities, energies, or operations, in that he is truly and properly a Person; differencing him from all creatures and finite things, as he is not a created Person; shewing him to be of an infinite and eternal essence, as he is truly and properly God; distinguishing him from the Father and the Son, as being not the Father, though the same God with the Father; not the Son, though the same God with him; demonstrating his order in the blessed Trinity, as being not the first or second, but the third Person, and therefore the third, because as the Son receiveth his essence communicated to him by the Father, and is therefore second to the Father, so the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence communicated to him by the Father and the Son, and so proceedeth from them both, and is truly and properly the Spirit of the Father, and as truly and properly the Spirit of the Son.

Thus far have we declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, what he is in himself, as the *Spirit of God;* it remaineth that we declare what is the office of the same, what he is unto us, as the *Holy* Spirit: for although the Spirit of God be of infinite, essential, and original holiness, as God, and so may be called Holy in himself; though other spirits which were created be either actually now unholy, or of defectible sanctity at the first, and so having the name of Spirit common unto them, he may be termed Holy, that he may be distinguished from them; yet I conceive he is rather called the Holy Spirit, or *the Spirit of* Rom. i. 4.

should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, without as great an authority as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this doctrine which never was used by any of the Greek Fathers.

PEARSON.

Holiness, because, of the three Persons in the blessed Trinity, it is his particular office to sanctify or make us holy.

Now when I speak of the office of the Holy Ghost, I do not understand any ministerial office or function, such as that of the
Heb. i. 14. created angels is, who are *all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation:* for I have 327
already proved this Spirit to be a Person properly Divine, and consequently above all ministration. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Persons in the Godhead
John iii. 16. are represented unto us as concurring unto our salvation: *God*
Eph. ii. 18. *so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son,* and *through* that Son *we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.* As therefore what our Saviour did and suffered for us belonged to that office of a Redeemer which he took upon him; so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his office. And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we are all impure and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence of God, whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us, therefore we acknowledge the office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of faith contained in this Article, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

Now this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility
1 Cor. ii. 11. of knowing the will of God; being as no *man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him; even so none*
1 Cor. ii. 10. *knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God;* this *Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God,* and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either external and general, or internal and particular. The

external and general work of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the revelation of the will of God, by which so much in all ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. For there have been *holy Prophets* ever *since the world began*, and *prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* When it pleased God *in the last days to speak unto us by his Son*, even that Son sent his Spirit into the Apostles, *the Spirit of truth*, that he might *guide* them *into all truth, teaching* them *all things, and bringing all things to* their *remembrance, whatsoever* Christ *had said unto* them. By this means it came to pass, that *all Scripture was given by inspiration of God*, that is, by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God; and so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe, was delivered by revelation. Again, the same Spirit which revealeth the object of faith generally to the universal Church of God, which object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular believer, doth also illuminate the understandings of such as believe, that they may receive the truth: for faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act: Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also *given* us *in the behalf of Christ to believe on him;* and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost, working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us: by this *the Lord opened the heart* of Lydia, *that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul;* by this *the word preached profiteth, being mixed with faith in them that hear it.* Thus *by grace are* we *saved through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.* As the in-
328 crease and perfection, so the original, or initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God[44], not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which

Luke i. 70. 2 Pet. i. 21. Heb. i. 2. John xvi. 13; xiv. 26. 2 Tim. iii. 16. Phil. i. 29. Acts xvi. 14. Heb. iv. 2. Eph. ii. 8.

44 This is the ancient determination of the second Arausican Council: 'Si quis sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum, quo in eum credimus, qui justificat impium, et ad regenerationem [Mansi reads 'generationem'] sacri baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratiæ donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus Sancti corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, sed naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, Apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente, *Confidimus, quia qui cœpit in vobis bonum opus perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Jesu Christi;* et illud, *Vobis datum est pro Christo, non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini.* Et, *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est.*' *Can.* 5. *Concil. Araus.* [Mansi viii. p. 713 B.] *et Gennad. Eccles. Dogm. cap.* 42.

we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths, which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness. And thus we affirm not only the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soul of man, to be part of the office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new Pelagians[45].

The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversation of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For

Titus iii. 5. *according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration,*
John iii. 5. *and renewing of the Holy Ghost.* So that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* We are all at first defiled by the corruption
1 Cor. vi. 11. of our nature, and the pollution of our sins, *but* we *are washed, but* we *are sanctified, but* we *are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* The second part then of the office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul.

The third part of this office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually do and perform those things which are acceptable and well-pleas-
Gal. v. 25. ing in the sight of God. *If we live in the Spirit,* quickened by his renovation, we must *also walk in the Spirit,* following his
Gal. v. 16. direction, led by his manuduction. And if we *walk in the Spirit,* we *shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh;* for we are not only directed but animated and acted in those operations by the Spirit
Rom. viii. 14. of God, *who giveth both to will and to do;* and *as many as are* thus *led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.* More-

45 It was the known opinion of the Pelagians, that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God; and St. Austin was once of that opinion: 'Neque enim fidem putabam,' says he, 'Dei gratia præveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non præcederet præconium veritatis: ut autem prædicato nobis evangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse proprium, et nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant, ante Episcopatum meum scripta.' *De Prædest. Sanct. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [§. 7. vol. x. p. 793 F.] But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a bishop, he recalled and reversed in his Retractations, *lib.* i. *cap.* 23. [vol. i. p. 34.] and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian heresy. This, as the rest of Pelagianism, is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechism deliver it in this manner; 'Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus Sancti interiore dono opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio.' [cap. 6. p. 165.]

over, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are also guided in our prayers, and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, *I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications.* Whereas then *this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us;* and whereas *we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.* From which intercession especially I conceive he hath the name of the *Paraclete* given him by Christ, who said, *I will pray unto the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete.* For *if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,* saith St. John: *who also maketh intercession for us,* saith St. Paul; and we have
329 *another Paraclete,* saith our Saviour; which also *maketh intercession for us,* saith St. Paul. A *Paraclete* then in the notion of the Scriptures is an Intercessor[46].

Zech. xii. 10. 1 John v. 14. Rom. viii. 26, 27. John xiv. 16. 1 John ii. 1. Rom. viii. 34.

[46] Παράκλητος is five times used in the Scriptures, and that by St. John alone: four times in his Gospel, attributed to the Holy Ghost; once in his first Epistle, spoken of Christ. When it relates to the Holy Ghost, we translate it always *Comforter;* when to Christ, we render it *Advocate:* of which diversity there can be no reason, because Christ, who is a Paraclete, said that he would send another Paraclete; and therefore the notion must be the same in both: Ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, τουτέστιν, ἄλλον ὡς ἐμέ. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. lxxv. §. 1. vol. viii. p. 439 A.] If therefore in the language of St. John Παράκλητος be a *Comforter,* then Christ is the Comforter; if Παράκλητος be an *Advocate,* the Holy Ghost is the Advocate. The Vulgar Latin keeps the Greek word in the Gospels, *Paracletus,* but in the Epistle renders it *Advocatus.* The Syriac keepeth the original altogether פרקליטא, as being of ordinary use in the writers of that and the Chaldee language; and therefore was not well translated *Paracletus* in the Gospels, and *Advocatus* in the Epistle, by Tremellius. That the Latins did use generally the word *Paracletus* for the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the Vulgar Latin, appeareth by the description of the heresy of Montanus, which Tertullian calls 'Novam prophetiam de Paracleto inundantem;' *De Resur. Carn. cap.* 63. [p. 365 A.] and 'Spiritalem rationem, Paracleto auctore.' *Cont. Marcion. lib.* i. *cap.* 29. [p. 380 D.] And yet the ancientest Latin translations rendered it *Advocatus* even in the Gospels, in reference to the Spirit: as we read it in Tertullian; 'Bene quod et Dominus usus hoc verbo in persona Paracleti, non divisionem significavit, sed dispositionem; *Rogabo enim,* inquit, *Patrem, et alium Advocatum mittet vobis, Spiritum veritatis.*' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 9. [p. 505 A.] So Novatianus; '*Ego rogabo Patrem, et alium Advocatum dabit vobis.* — Necnon etiam subdidit illud quoque, *Advocatus autem ille Spiritus Sanctus quem missurus est Pater, ille vos docebit.*' *De Trin. cap.* 28. [p. 726 D.] '*Cum venerit Advocatus ille, quem ego mittam.*' *Apud S. Hilar. de Trin. lib.* viii. §. 19. Notwithstanding *Consolator* also is of good antiquity: as we read in the same St. Hilary; 'Sumus nunc quidem consolati quia Dominus ait, *Mittet vobis Pater et alium Consolato-*

Fourthly, The office of the same Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our

rem.' *Enar. in Psal.* cxxv. [p. 410 B.] And it is possible that some which used *Advocatus* might understand so much: for in the ancient Christian Latin, *advocare* signifieth to comfort, and *advocatio* consolation; as being the bare interpretations of παρακαλεῖν and παράκλησις. As Tertullian translates παρακαλέσαι πενθοῦντας, Isa. lxi. 2. *Advocare languentes. Adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 14. [p. 426 C.] So when we read, 'Væ vobis divitibus, quia habetis consolationem vestram;' Tertullian read it, 'Væ vobis divitibus, quoniam recepistis advocationem vestram.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 427 C.] And speaking in his own language; '*Beati*, inquit, *flentes atque lugentes.* Quis talia sine patientia tolerat? Itaque talibus et advocatio et risus promittitur.' *De Patien. cap.* 11. [p. 166 C.] And as St. Hilary read it, so did St. Augustin expound it; 'Consolabuntur Spiritu Sancto, qui maxime propterea Paracletus nominatur, id est, Consolator.' *De Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. [vol. iii. part ii. p. 167 C.] 'Cum Christus promiserit suis missurum se Paracletum, id est, Consolatorem vel Advocatum.' *Cont. Faust. lib.* xiii. *cap.* 17. [vol. viii. p. 262 B.] 'Consolator ergo ille, vel Advocatus, utrumque enim interpretatur quod est Græce Paracletus, &c.' *Tract.* 94. *in Joan.* §. 2. [vol. iii. part ii. p. 728 B.] And as they read or expounded it, so did the Arabic translator render it by two several words, one in the Gospel, another in the Epistle, both signifying *Consolator.* Now what they meant by *Advocatus* is evident, that is, one which should plead the cause of Christians against their adversaries which accused and persecuted them; that as there is an accuser which is a spirit, even Satan; so there should be an Advocate to plead against that accuser, even the Holy Spirit. 'Necessarius nobis est ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuosi efficiamur; et ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habemus et Paracletum.' *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 19. [cap. 17. §. 3. p. 208.] 'Hic ipse [Spiritus] et in Prophetis populum accusavit, et in Apostolis advocationem gentibus præstitit. Nam illi ut accusarentur merebantur, quia contempserant legem; et qui ex gentibus credunt ut patrocinio Spiritus adjuventur merentur, quia ad evangelicam pervenire gestiunt legem.' *Novatian. de Trin. cap.* 29. [p. 727 B.] And again; 'Quoniam Dominus in cœlos esset abiturus, Paracletum discipulis necessario dabat, ne illos quodammodo pupillos, quod minime decebat, relinqueret, et sine Advocato et quodam Tutore desereret.' *Ibid.* In this sense it was, that when Vettius pleaded for the Gallican martyrs before their persecutors ἠξίου ἀκουσθῆναι ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, endeavouring to clear them from all impiety objected to them, he was called the Παράκλητος of the Christians, ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων, παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν χρηματίσας. *Acta Mart. Gal. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 1. [p. 200.] In the same notion did the ancient Rabbins use the same word retained in their language, פרקליט, as appeareth by that in the *Pirke Avoth, cap.* 4. [ed. Venice 1567, f. 55. col. 1.] העושה מצוה אחת קונה לו פרקליט אחד והעובר עברה אחת קונה לו קטיגור אחד: *He which keepeth one commandment gaineth one Advocate, and he which transgresseth one getteth one Accuser.* As therefore קטיגור is Κατήγορος, so פרקליט is Συνήγορος, or *Patronus qui causam rei agit.* And so *Advocatus* is ordinarily understood for him which pleadeth and maintaineth the cause of any one. But I conceive there were other *Advocati*, and especially Παράκλητοι among the Greeks, who did not plead or maintain the cause, but did only assist with their presence, entreating and interceding by way of petition to the judges, such as were the friends of the *reus*, called by him to his assistance, and interceding for him; in both which respects they were called Παράκλητοι. As we read in Isæus, Τοὺς φίλους παρακαλέσαντες, καὶ ῥήτορας παρασκευασάμενοι· [p. 36,] the Ῥήτορες were to plead, the φίλοι παράκλητοι were to intercede. The action of these *Advocati*

Saviour is the Head. *For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body*[47]. And *as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.* (*Hereby we know that God abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.*) As we become spiritual men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the Body and unto the Head is a spiritual conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and *he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.* 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. 1 John iii. 24. 1 Cor. vi. 17.

330 Fifthly, It is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. *The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.* And *because* we *are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into* our *hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* (*For* we *have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but* we *have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.*) *The Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.*) As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption; and because being sons we are also *heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ,* by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For *he which stablisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts;* so that we are Rom. v. 5. Rom. viii. 14. Gal. iv. 6. Rom. viii. 15, 16. Rom. viii. 17. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

was called Παράκλησις, and by the ancient Grammarians Παράκλησις is interpreted Δέησις· as Harpocration; Τίθεται μέντοι σπανίως καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς δεήσεως· Λυκοῦργος, ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἱερείας, προειπὼν, Εἰ μὲν ὑπὲρ ἰδίου τινὸς ἦν ὁ ἀγὼν, ἐδεόμην ἂν ὑμῶν μετ' εὐνοίας ἀκοῦσαί μου· μετ' ὀλίγον φησὶ, Νυνὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς οἶμαι τοῦτο ποιήσειν, καὶ χωρὶς παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐμῆς. And that the action of the Παράκλητοι was δέησις, *entreaty*, and *petition*, appears by those words of Demosthenes; Αἱ δὲ τῶν παρακλήτων τούτων δέησεις καὶ σπουδαὶ τῶν ἰδίων πλεονεξιῶν ἕνεκα ἐγίνοντο. *Orat.* περὶ παραπρ. [p. 341.] Of these Παράκλητοι is Æschines to be understood; Τὴν μὲν παρασκευὴν ὁρᾶτε —καὶ τὴν παράταξιν ὅση γεγένηται, καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν δεήσεις, αἷς κέχρηνταί τινες. *Orat.* κατὰ Κτησ. [p. 53.] Thus I conceive the notion of Παράκλητος, common to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, to consist especially in the office of intercession, which by St. Paul is attributed to both, and is thus expressed of the Spirit by Novatianus; 'Qui interpellat divinas aures pro nobis gemitibus ineloquacibus, advocationis implens officia, et defensionis exhibens munera.' *De Trin. cap.* 29. [p. 728 A.]

47 'Dominus pollicitus est mittere se Paracletum, qui nos aptaret Deo. Sicut enim de arido tritico massa una fieri non potest sine humore, neque unus panis; ita nec nos multi unum fieri in Christo Jesu poteramus, sine aqua quæ de cœlo est.' *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 19. [c. 17. §. 2. p. 208.]

Eph. i. 13, 14. *sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.* The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge; as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due; yet is to be looked upon as an earnest[48], being part of that reward which is promised,

48 The word ἀρραβών, which the Apostle only useth in this particular, is of an Hebrew extraction, ערבון from ערב, a word of promise and engagement in commerce, bargains, and agreements; and being but in one particular affair used in the Old Testament, is taken for a pledge, Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20. and translated ἀρραβών by the LXX, as well as משכונא by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwise, consonantly enough to the origination, signifieth rather an *earnest* than a *pledge*, as the Greeks and Latins generally agree: *Hesych.* Ἀρραβὼν, πρόδομα. *Etymol.* Ἀρραβών, ἡ ἐπὶ ταῖς ὠναῖς παρὰ τῶν ὠνουμένων διδομένη προκαταβολὴ ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας. Which words are also extant in Suidas, but corruptly. To this purpose is cited that of Menander;

——————————— Μικροῦ
Μὲν ἀρραβῶνά μ' ἔπεισεν εὐθὺς καταβαλεῖν. *Etymol. M. in* Ἀρραβών.

So Aristotle speaking of Thales, εὐπορήσαντα χρημάτων ὀλίγων ἀρραβῶνας διαδοῦνα τῶν ἐλαιουργίων. *Polit. lib.* i. *cap.* 11. [§. 9.] So the Latins; 'Arrhabo sic dicta, ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum a Græco ἀρραβών. Reliquum ex eo quod debitum reliquit.' *Varro de Ling. Lat. lib.* iv. [lib. v. p. 175.] 'In terrenis negotiis arrhæ quantitas contractus illius pro quo intercesserit quædam portio est; pignoris vero ratio meritum rei pro qua poni videtur excedit.' *Paschas. Diac. de Sp. S. lib.* i. *cap.* 11. [p. 738 F.] 'Pignus Latinus interpres pro *arrhabone* posuit. Non idipsum autem *arrhabo* quod *pignus* sonat. Arrhabo enim futuræ emptioni quasi quoddam testimonium et obligamentum datur. Pignus vero, hoc est, ἐνέχυρον, pro mutua pecunia opponitur, ut cum illa reddita fuerit, reddenti debitum pignus a creditore reddatur.' *S. Hieron. ad Ephes.* i. 14. [vol. vii. p. 560 E.] There is such another observation in A. Gellius, upon these words of Q. Claudius, *Cum tantus arrhabo penes Samnites populi Romani esset.* 'Arrhabonem dixit sexcentos obsides; et id maluit quam pignus dicere, quoniam vis hujus vocabuli in ea sententia gravior æriorque est.' *Noct. Att. lib.* xvii. *cap.* 2. The sense and use of this word is evident in Plautus;

Th. ——— *Eas quanti destinat?*
Tr. *Talentis magnis totidem, quot ego et tu sumus.*
Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadraginta minas.
Mostell. act. iii. sc. 1. ver. 113.

The sum was 120*l.* of which he gave 40*l.* in part of payment, and this was the *arrhabo*. So the Greek fathers interpret St. Paul; Διὰ μέντοι τοῦ ἀρραβῶνος ἠνίξατο τῶν δοθησομένων τὸ μέγεθος· ὁ γὰρ ἀρραβὼν μικρόν τι μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ παντός. *Theodoret. in* 2 *Cor.* i. 22. [vol. iii. p. 217 A.] Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἀρραβὼν τὸ νῦν δοθὲν ὀνομάζεται, ὡς πολλαπλασίας ἐκεῖ δοθησομένης τῆς χάριτος. *Idem in* 1 *Cor.* xv. 44. [p. 205 D.] Οὐδὲ Πνεῦμα εἶπεν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἀρραβῶνα ὠνόμασεν, ἵνα ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντὸς θαρρῇς. *S. Chrysost. ad* 2 *Cor.* i. 22. [Hom. iii. §. 4. vol. x. p. 447 E.] In this manner speaks Eusebius; Τὰ πρωτόλεια τῶν ἐπάθλων ἐνθένδε προαρραβωνίζεται. *De Vit. Constant. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [p. 499.] Οὔτε γὰρ πᾶν κεκοιμίσμεθα οὔτε παντὸς ὑστεροῦμεν· ἀλλ' οἷον ἀρραβῶνα τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν καὶ τοῦ πατρώου πλούτου προσειλήφαμεν. *Theodor. in Clem. Alex.* 802. So Tertullian; 'Hic sequester Dei atque hominum appellatus, ex utriusque partis deposito commisso sibi, carnis quoque depositum servat in semetipso, arrhabonem summæ totius. Quemadmodum enim nobis arrhabonem Spiritus reliquit, ita et a nobis arrhabonem carnis accepit, et vexit in cœlum pignus totius summæ

and, upon the condition of performance of the Covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

Sixthly, For the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the office of the same Spirit to sanctify and set apart persons for the duty of the ministry, ordaining them to intercede between God and his people, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the Gospel, to administer the sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary *for the perfecting of the saints, for* Eph. iv. 12. *the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* The same Spirit which illuminated the Apostles, and endued 331 them with power from above to perform personally their apostolical functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry unto the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to *take heed* Acts xx. 28. *unto* their *selves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made* them *overseers, to feed the Church of God.*

By these and the like means doth the Spirit of God sanctify the sons of men, and by virtue of this sanctification, proceeding immediately from his office, he is properly called the Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the object of our faith contained in this Article, what is the Holy Ghost in whom we believe, both in relation to his nature[49], as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth, first, from the nature and condition of the Creed, whereof it is an essential part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a Creed. For being the Creed is a profession of that faith into

illuc quandoque redigendæ.' *De Resur. Carn. cap.* 51. [p. 357 B.] 'Plane accepit et hic Spiritum caro, sed arrhabonem; animæ autem non arrhabonem sed plenitudinem.' *Ibid. cap.* 53. [p. 360 A.] So though the translator of Irenæus render ἀρραβών *pignus*, yet it is evident that Irenæus did understand by ἀρραβών an *earnest*. 'Quod et pignus dixit Apostolus, hoc est partem ejus honoris qui a Deo nobis promissus est, in epistola quæ ad Ephesios est;' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* v. *cap.* 11. [c. 8. §. 1. p. 301.] and a little after; 'Si enim pignus complectens hominem in semetipsum, jam facit dicere, *Abba Pater*, quid faciet universa Spiritus gratia quæ hominibus dabitur a Deo? Similes nos ei efficiet, et perficiet voluntate Patris.'

[49] In respect of the nature of the Holy Ghost, I have endeavoured the same which Faustus Rhegiensis did, of whom Gennadius relates thus much: 'Faustus ex Abbate Lirinensis monasterii apud regnum Galliæ Episcopus factus, vir in divinis Scripturis satis intentus, ex traditione Symboli occasione accepta, composuit librum de Spiritu Sancto, in quo ostendit eum juxta fidem Patrum consubstantialem et coæternalem esse Patri et Filio, ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinentem.' *Catal. Illust. Vir.* 85. [in S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 983.]

Matt. xxviii. 19.

which we are baptized; being the first rule of faith was derived from the sacred form of baptism; being we are baptized *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* we are obliged to profess faith in them three; that as they are distinguished in the institution, so they may be distinguished in our profession. And therefore the briefest comprehensions of faith have always included the Holy Ghost, and some concluded with it[50].

50 I have formerly shewn at large how the Creed did first arise from the Baptismal institution, p. 55, above. And therefore as the name of the Holy Ghost is an essential part of that form, so must the belief in him be as essential to the Creed, which was at first nothing else but an explication of that form. The first enlargement and explication we find in Justin Martyr thus expressed: Ἐπονομάζεται—τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα·—καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται. *Apol.* i. §. 61. [p. 80 B.] And the rule of faith delivered soon after by Irenæus is very consonant unto it: Εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς—καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας· καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις. *Adv. Hæres. lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [c. 10. p. 48.] As that delivered soon after him by Tertullian; 'Unicum quidem Deum credimus; sub hac tamen dispensatione (quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus) ut unici Dei sit et Filius Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum: hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos. Qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.' *Adv. Prax. cap.* 2. [p. 501 B.] Indeed there is an objection made against this truth by the Socinians, who would have us believe that in the first Creeds or rules of faith the Holy Ghost was not included. Thus Schlictingius writing against Meisner; 'Porro observatum est a quibusdam tertiam hanc Symboli istius partem quæ a Spiritu Sancto incipit, ab initio defuisse, seu in Symbolo non fuisse additam; idque non immerito, cum non personas ullas in quas credendum sit (quas solas, ut apparet, auctoribus Symboli commemorare propositum fuit), sed res tantum credendas complectatur, quæ implicite fide in Deum et in Jesum Christum omnes continentur. Hoc si ita est sane, defuit tertia Persona, quæ Deum illum unum nobis declararet. Tertullianus sane auctor antiquissimus et temporibus Apostolorum proximus, hanc tertiam Symboli istius partem non tantum ita non apposuit, ut omitteret; sed ita ut excluderet.' *Lib. de Virginibus velandis.* But as he argues very warily with his *Hoc si ita est,* so he disputes most fallaciously: for first he makes Tertullian the most ancient and next to the Apostles, and so would bring an example of the first Creed from him; whereas Justin Martyr and Irenæus were both before him, and they both mention expressly the Holy Ghost in their rules of faith. Secondly, he makes Tertullian exclude the Holy Ghost from the rule of faith, which he clearly expresseth in the place forecited: and therefore that place by him mentioned cannot be an exclusion, but an omission only; and the cause of that omission in that place is evident, that he might bring in his opinion of the Paracletus with the better

Secondly, It is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, not only for the acknowledgment of the eminency of his person, but
332 also for a desire of the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the Apostle wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with* us *all.* For *if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;* if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him; if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and *no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* *That which is born of the spirit is spirit;* such is their felicity which have it: *That which is born of the flesh is flesh;* such is their infelicity which want it. What then is to be desired in comparison of *the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ;* especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, *If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*

2 Cor. xiii. 14. Rom. viii. 9. 1 Cor. xii. 3. John iii. 6. Phil. i. 19. Luke xi. 13.

Thirdly, It is necessary to profess faith in the Holy Ghost, that *the will of God* may be effectual in us, *even* our *sanctification.* For if *God hath from the beginning chosen* us *to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit;* if we be *elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience;* if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called holy, because he is to sanctify us, how should we *follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord!* how should we endeavour to *cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God! The temple of God is holy,*

1 Thess. iv. 3. 2 Thess. ii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. xii. 14. 2 Cor. vii. 1. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

advantage. Thus when Eusebius Cæsariensis gave in a copy of the Creed (by which he was catechized, baptized, and consecrated) to the Council of Nice, it runs thus, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα, &c. καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν, &c. πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, and there concludes. [Socr. i. c. 8. p. 23.] In conformity whereunto the Nicene Council, altering some things, and adding others against the Arians, concludeth in the same manner, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. And the Arian bishops in the Synod at Antioch not long after: Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι, πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. [Socr. ii. c. 10. p. 87.] From whence it appeareth that the profession of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was counted essential to the Creed; the rest which followeth was looked upon as a προσθήκη. 'Quid nunc de Spiritu Sancto dicemus, quem credere consequente Symboli parte in Trinitate præcipimur?' *Alc. Avit. Fragm. Serm. de Symb.* [Galland. x. p. 751 D.]

which temple we *are*, if *the Spirit of God dwelleth in* us; for the inhabitation of God is a consecration, and that place must be a
1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. temple where his honour dwelleth. Now if we *know that* our *body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in* us *which* we *have of God;* if we know that we *are not our own*, for that we *are bought with a price;* we must also know that we ought *therefore to glorify God in our body, and in our spirit, which are God's:* thus it is necessary to believe in the Spirit of sanctification,
1 Thess. iii. 13. that *our hearts may be established unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.*

Fourthly, It is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace
Rom. xiv. 17. and inward joy. (*For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*) We read
Acts xiii. 52. of the Disciples at first, that they *were filled with joy and with*
1 Thess. i. 6. *the Holy Ghost;* and those which afterwards *became followers of* them *and of the Lord, received the word in much affliction,* but
John vii. 38. *with joy of the Holy Ghost.* (These are *the rivers of living water*
Ps. xlv. 7. *flowing out of his belly that believeth;*) this is *the oil of gladness*
Heb. i. 9. wherewith the Son of God was *anointed above his fellows,* but
1 John ii. 20, 27. yet with the same oil his fellows are anointed also: for we *have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which* we *receive of him abideth in* us.

Lastly, The belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. For
Luke iv. 18. as God the Father sent the Son, and *the Spirit of the Lord was upon* him, *because he had anointed* him *to preach the Gospel;* so the
John xx. 21, 22. Son sent the Apostles, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost:* and as the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others by virtue of the same Spirit, as St. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to
1 Tim. v. 22. send others, saying to Timothy, *Lay hands suddenly on no man,* 333
Titus i. 5. and to Titus, *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.* Thus by virtue of an apostolical ordination there is for ever to be continued a ministerial succes-

sion. Those which are thus separated by ordination to the work of the Lord, are to *feed the flock of God which is among* 1 Pet. v. 2. them, *taking the oversight thereof;* and those which are committed to their care, are to *remember and obey them that have the* Heb. xiii. *rule over them, and submit themselves, for* that *they watch for their* 7, 17. *souls as they that must give account.*

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this Article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to profess, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much; I freely and resolvedly assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a Person, of a true, real, and personal subsistence, not a created, but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternal God; that though he be that God, yet he is not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: I believe this infinite and eternal Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectible holiness in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed Apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification, of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternal Spirit of God; in this manner is that Spirit holy; and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

334 ## ARTICLE IX.

The Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints.

IN this ninth Article we meet with some variety of position, and with much addition; for whereas it is here the ninth, in

some Creeds we find it the last[51]; and whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented; the most ancient professing no more than to believe *the Holy Church*[52]: and the Greeks having added, by

51 Although generally the article of *the Holy Church* did immediately follow the article of the Holy Ghost, as Tertullian well observeth, 'Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est:' *De Baptis. cap.* 6. [p. 226 D.] and St. Augustin; 'Spiritus Sanctus si creatura non creator esset, profecto creatura rationalis esset; ipsa est enim summa creatura. Et ideo in Regula fidei non poneretur ante Ecclesiam, quia et ipse ad Ecclesiam pertineret:' *Enchir. cap.* 56. [vol. vi. p. 217 E.] and the author of the first book *de Symb. ad Catechum.* 'Sequitur post Trinitatis commendationem, *sanctam Ecclesiam*:' *cap.* 6. [Augustin. Op. vol. vi. p. 554 D.] and St. Jerom, cited in the next note; yet notwithstanding this order was not always observed, but sometimes this article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of St. Cyprian; 'Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discrepare; sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis et schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non dari, nisi per sanctam Ecclesiam, posse.' *Epist. ad Magn.* [Ep. 76. p. 154.] Thus Arius and Euzoius, in the words hereafter cited, place the Church in the conclusion of their Creed. And the author of the second book *de Symb. ad Catechum.* placeth the remission of sins after the Holy Ghost; 'Noli injuriam facere illi qui fecit te, ut consequaris ab illo, quod in isto sancto Symbolo sequitur, *Remissionem omnium peccatorum;*' *cap.* 10. [§. 21. p. 566 D.] and after he hath spoken of the resurrection and life everlasting, proceedeth thus to speak of the Church; '*Sancta Ecclesia,* in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur auctoritas,' &c.: *cap.* 13. [§. 24. p. 568 C.] The author of the third; 'Ideo sacramenti hujus conclusio per Ecclesiam terminatur, quia ipsa est mater fœcunda:' *cap.* 12. And the author of the fourth; '*Sanctam Ecclesiam.* Propterea hujus conclusio sacramenti per sanctam Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit a numero filiorum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem:' *cap.* 13. [§. 13. p. 582 C.] Thus therefore they disposed the last part of the Creed; 'Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, peccatorum remissionem, carnis resurrectionem, et vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam.' And the design of this transposition was to signify, that remission of sins and a resurrection to eternal life are to be obtained in and by the Church: as the Creed in the first Homily under the name of St. Chrysostom; 'Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Iste Spiritus perducit ad sanctam Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam.'

52 'Quæ est mater nostra, in quam repromisimus sanctam Ecclesiam.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* v. *cap.* 4. [p. 465 B.] So Ruffinus, 'Sanctam Ecclesiam.' For *Catholicam* is added by Pamelius. So St. Jerom; 'Præterea cum solenne sit in lavacro post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, *Credis sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum?* Quam Ecclesiam credidisse eum dicis? Arianorum? sed non habent; nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit:' *Adv. Lucif.* [§. 12. vol. ii. p. 184 D.] and St. Au-

way of explication or determination, the word *Catholick*, it was at last received into the Latin Creed.

To begin then with the first part of the Article, I shall endeavour so to expound it, as to shew what is the meaning of the Church, which Christ hath propounded to us; how that Church is *holy*, as the Apostle hath assured us; how that holy Church is *catholick*, as the Fathers have taught us. For when I say,
335 *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*, I mean that there is a Church which is holy, and which is catholick[53]; and I under-

gustin; 'Credimus et sanctam Ecclesiam,' with this declaration, 'utique Catholicam.' *De Fide et Symb. cap.* 10. [vol. vi. p. 161 F.] So Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, and Venantius Fortunatus. The author of the first book *de Symb. ad Catechum.* 'Sequitur post Trinitatis commendationem, *Sanctam Ecclesiam:*' *cap.* 6. [Augustin. Op. vol. vi. p. 554 D.] The author of the other three, who placeth this article last of all; '*Sancta Ecclesia*, in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur auctoritas;' *lib.* ii. *cap.* 13. and *lib.* iv. *cap.* 13. expressly, *Per sanctam Ecclesiam*, as the words of the Creed, with the explication before mentioned: as also the interrogation of the Novatians ending with *Per sanctam Ecclesiam*, cited before out of St. Cyprian. So likewise of those two Homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom, the first hath *Sanctam Ecclesiam* after the belief in the Holy Ghost, the second concludeth the Creed with *Per sanctam Ecclesiam.* 'In carnis resurrectione fides, in vita æterna spes, in sancta Ecclesia charitas.' Thus the ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus; Tha halgan gelathinge, i. e. *The holy Church;* the Greek Creed in Saxon letters in sir Robert Cotton's Library, and the old Latin Creed in the Oxford Library. 'Deus qui in cœlis habitat, et condidit ex nihilo ea quæ sunt, et multiplicavit propter sanctam Ecclesiam suam, irascitur tibi.' *Herm. lib.* i. *Vis.* 1. [p. 75.] 'Virtute sua potenti condidit sanctam Ecclesiam suam.' *Ibid.* [p. 76.] 'Rogabam Dominum, ut revelationes ejus, quas mihi ostendit per sanctam Ecclesiam suam, confirmaret.' *Idem, Vis.* 4. [p. 82.] But though it were not in the Roman or Occidental Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Oriental, particularly in that of Jerusalem, and that of Alexandria. In the Creed at Jerusalem it was certainly very ancient; for it is expounded by St. Cyril, Archbishop of that place, Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Catech.* 18. [p. 285 A.] And in the Alexandrian it was as ancient; for Alexander, Archbishop of that place, inserts it in his confession in his Epistle *ad Alexandrum;* Μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 4. [p. 19.] And Arius and Euzoius, in their confession of faith given in to Constantine, thus conclude, Καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [p. 61.] The same is also expressed in both the Creeds, the lesser and the greater, delivered by Epiphanius *in Ancorato;* the words are repeated in the next observation.

53 'Credo sanctam Ecclesiam,' *I believe there is an holy Church;* or, 'Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam,' is the same: nor does the particle *in* added or subtracted make any difference. For although some of the Latin and Greek Fathers press the force of that preposition, as is before observed, though Ruffinus urge it far in this particular; 'Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate divinitas doceatur, sicut dictum est, in Deo Patre credi, adjecta præpositione *in*, ita et in Christo Filio ejus, ita et in Spiritu Sancto memoratur. Sed ut manifestius fiat quod dicimus, ex consequentibus approbabitur. Sequitur namque post hunc sermonem, *Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem.* Non dixit, in sanctam Ecclesiam, nec in

stand that Church alone which is both catholick and holy: and being this holiness and catholicism are but affections of this Church which I believe, I must first declare what is the true nature and notion of the Church; how I am assured of the existence of that Church; and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominal definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, *Church* or *Kirk*[54], it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is, of Christ, and from thence was taken to signify the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The Greek word, used by the Apostles to express the Church, signifieth *a calling forth*[55], if we look upon the origination; a congregation

remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem, si enim addidisset *in* præpositionem, una eademque vis fuisset cum superioribus. Ne autem (*f.* Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi de divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, et in Jesu Christo Filio ejus, et in Spiritu Sancto; in cæteris vero ubi non de divinitate, sed de creaturis ac mysteriis sermo est, *in* præpositio non additur, ut dicatur in sanctam Ecclesiam, sed sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse, non ut in Deum, sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam; et remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum; et resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque præpositionis syllaba creator a creaturis secernitur et divina separantur ab humanis: *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 35, 36. p. ccxxiii.]—though, I say, this expression be thus pressed, yet we are sure that the Fathers did use εἰς and *in* for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already [p. 29, note 36.] produced the authorities of St. Cyril, Arius, and Euzoius, and that of Epiphanius *in Ancorato*. Thus also the Latins, as St. Cyprian; 'In æternam pœnam sero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt.' *Ad Demetrianum.* [p. 224.] So *Interpres Irenæi;* 'Quotquot autem timent Deum, et credunt in adventum Filii ejus,' &c. So Chrysologus; '*In Sanctam Ecclesiam.* Quia Ecclesia in Christo, et in Ecclesia Christus est; qui ergo Ecclesiam fatetur, in Ecclesiam se confessus est credidisse.' *Serm.* 62. [p. 708 A.] And in the ancient edition of St. Jerom in the place before cited it was read, 'Credis in Sanctam Ecclesiam,' and the word *in* was left out by Victorius.

54 Κύριος *the Lord*, and that properly Christ; from whence Κυριακός, *belonging to the Lord Christ;* οἶκος Κυριακός, *the Lord's house*, from thence *Kyriac, Kyrk*, and *Church*.

55 The word used by the Apostles is ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκαλεῖν *evocare*. From ἐκκέκλησαι, ἔκκλησις, from ἔκκλησις, ἐκκλησία, of the same notation with the Hebrew מקרא. 'Ecclesia quippe ex vocatione appellata est.' *S. August. Expos. ad Rom.* [§. 2. vol. iii. part ii. p. 925 D.] And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signify *convocatio*, as St. Augustin; 'Inter congregationem, unde Synagoga, et convocationem, unde Ecclesia nomen accepit, distat aliquid;' *Enar. in Psal.* lxxxi. [vol. iv. p. 870 D.] yet the origination speaks only of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in σύγκλητος. From whence arose that definition of Methodius, Ὅτι ἐκκλησία παρὰ τὸ ἐκκεκλῆκέναι τὰς ἡδονὰς λέγεσθαί φησιν. *Phot. Biblioth.* §. 235. [p. 304.] Whereas ἐκκαλεῖν is here no more

of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully express the nature of the Church, what it is in itself, and as it is propounded to our belief.

Our second observation is, that the Church hath been taken for the whole complex of men and angels worshipping the same God; and again, the angels being not considered, it hath been taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the foundation of the world[56]. But being Christ took not upon him the nature of angels, and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood, or call them by his
336 word; being they are not in the Scriptures mentioned as parts or members of the Church, nor can be imagined to be built upon the Prophets or Apostles; being we are at this time to speak of the proper notion of the Church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending any more than the sons of men. Again, being though Christ was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and whosoever from the beginning pleased God were saved by his blood; yet because there was a vast difference between the several dispensations of the Law and Gospel, because our Saviour spake expressly of building himself a Church when the Jewish Synagogue was about to fail, because

than καλεῖν, ἔκκλησις no more than κλῆσις, as κλητεύειν and ἐκκλητύειν with the Attics were the same: from whence it came to pass that the same preposition hath been twice added in the composition of the same word; from ἐκκαλεῖν, ἐκκλησία, from thence ἐκκλησιάζειν, and because the preposition had no signification in the use of that word, from thence ἐξεκκλησιάζειν, *to convocate*, or *call together*. But yet ἐκκλησία is not the same with ἔκκλησις, not the evocation or the action of calling, but the κλητοί or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence ἐκκλησιάζειν is *to gather together*, or *to be gathered*. Hence St. Cyril; Ἐκκλησία δὲ καλεῖται φερωνύμως, διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ συνάγειν. *Catech.* 18. [§. 24 p. 296 C.] So Ammonius; Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν σύνοδον τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν To this purpose do the LXX. use ἐκκλησιάζειν actively, to convocate or call together an assembly, as ἐκκλησιάζειν λαόν, and ἐκκλησιάζειν συναγωγήν, and ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι passively, as Ἐξεκκλησιάσθη πᾶσα ἡ συναγωγή, Jos. xviii. 1. which the Attic writers would have expressed by ἐκκλησίαζε, as Aristophanes;

Ἔδοξέ μοι περὶ πρῶτον ὕπνον ἐν τῇ Πυκνὶ
Ἐκκλησιάζειν πρόβατα συγκαθήμενα.
Vesp. v. 31.

Where though the Scholiast hath rendered it, Ἐκκλησιάζειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνάγειν, whereby the lexicographers have been deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Attics use it. Howsoever from the notation of the word we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the mass or generality of mankind; first, because the preposition ἐκ hath no such force in the use of the word; secondly, because the collection or coming together is not specified in the origination.

56 'Translatus in Paradisum, jam tunc de mundo in Ecclesiam.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib.* ii. *cap.* 6. [p. 383 B.]

Catholicism, which is here attributed unto the Church, must be understood in opposition to the legal singularity of the Jewish nation, because the ancient Fathers were generally wont to distinguish between the Synagogue and the Church[57], therefore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.

Thirdly, Therefore I observe that the only way to attain unto the knowledge of the true notion of the Church, is to search into the New Testament, and from the places there which mention it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will be necessary to take notice that our Saviour first speaking of it, mentioneth it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be[58]; as when he spake unto the great Apostle,

Matt. xvi. 18. *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church;* but when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down,

Acts ii. 41. when Peter had converted *three thousand souls* which were added

Acts i. 15. to the *hundred and twenty* Disciples, then was there a Church, (and that built upon Peter, according to our Saviour's promise[59],)

Acts ii. 47. for after that we read, *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.* A Church then our Saviour promised should be built, and by a promise made before his death; after his

57 Thus St. Ignatius speaking of Christ; Αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ Πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία. *Epist. ad Philad.* §. 9. [p. 32.] Where ἡ ἐκκλησία is plainly taken for the multitude of Christians who were converted to the faith by the Apostles, and those who were afterwards joined to them in the profession of the same faith. 'Sacrificia in populo, sacrificia in Ecclesia.' *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iv. *cap.* 34. [c. 18. §. 2. p. 250.] 'Disseminaverunt sermonem de Christo Patriarchæ et Prophetæ; demessa est autem Ecclesia, hoc est, fructum percepit.' *Idem, lib.* iv. *cap.* 42. [c. 25. §. 3. p. 261.] 'Quid? Judaicus populus circa beneficia divina perfidus et ingratus, nonne quod a Deo primum recessit impatientiæ crimen fuit?—Impatientia etiam in Ecclesia hæreticos facit.' *S. Cyprian. de Bono Patient.* [p. 253.] 'Quis non agnoscat Christum—reliquisse matrem Synagogam Judæorum, veteri Testamento carnaliter adhærentem, et adhæsisse uxori suæ, sanctæ Ecclesiæ?' *S. August. cont. Faust. lib.* xii. *cap.* 8. [vol. viii. p. 230 E.] 'Mater sponsi Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Synagoga est; proinde nurus ejus Ecclesia. *Idem, Enar. in Psal.* xliv. [§. 12. vol. iv. p. 387 F.]

58 'In quem tingueret?—in Ecclesiam? quam nondum Apostoli struxerant.' *Tertul. de Bapt. cap.* 11. [p. 228 E.]

59 'Qualis es evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem. *Super te,* inquit, *ædificabo Ecclesiam meam;* et *Dabo tibi claves,* non Ecclesiæ.—Sic enim et exitus docet: in ipso Ecclesia exstructa est, id est, per ipsum, ipse clavem imbuit; vides quam; *Viri Israelitæ, auribus mandate quæ dico: Jesum Nazarenum virum a Deo vobis destinatum,* et reliqua.' *Tertul. de Pud. cap.* 21. [p. 574 B.] So St. Basil; Εὐθὺς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης νοοῦμεν τὸν τοῦ Ἰωνᾶ — τὸν διὰ πίστεως ὑπεροχὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δεξάμενον. *Adv. Eunom. lib.* ii. [§. 4. vol. i. p. 240 D.] St. Peter took upon himself the building of the Church, that is, to build the Church, which he then performed, when he preached the Gospel by which the Church was first gathered.

ascension, and upon the preaching of St. Peter, we find a Church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily increase. We cannot then take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the Church of Christ, than by looking into the origination and increase thereof; without which it is impossible to have a right conception of it[60].

Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a Church of Christ is only this: there were twelve Apostles with the Disciples before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and *the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty.* Acts i. 15. When the Holy Ghost came after a powerful and miraculous manner upon the blessed Apostles, and St. Peter preached unto the Jews, that they should *repent and be baptized in the name of* Acts ii. 38, 337 *Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; they that gladly received his* 41, 42. *word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.* These being thus added to the rest, *continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers;* and all these persons so continuing are called the Church[61]. What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were Apostles, some the former Disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, joining in the public prayers presented unto God. This was then the Church, which was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up *the multitude of* Acts iv. 32. *them that believed,* who *were of one heart and one soul, believers* Acts v. 14. *added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.*

But though the Church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one; and so the notion of the first Church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to express the nature of that

60 Tertullian mentioning the Acts of the Apostles, addeth these words; 'Quam Scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritus Sancti esse possunt, qui necdum Spiritum possint agnoscere discentibus missum; sed nec Ecclesiam defendere, qui quando et quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus, probare non habent.' *De Præscr. Hæret. cap.* 22. [p. 209 D.]

61 'Cum remisissent summi sacerdotes Petrum et Joannem, et reversi essent ad reliquos coapostolos et discipulos Domini, id est in Ecclesiam.' *S. Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 12. [§. 5. p. 195.]

Church which we believe; yet because that Church was one by way of origination[62], and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of several Churches; and that Church which we believe, is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all Churches into it; it will be necessary to consider, how at the first those several Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one Church they are all united. To which purpose it will be farther fit to examine the several acceptions of this word, as it is diversely used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament; that, if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we collect and conclude the full notion of the Church from thence.

First then, That word which signifies the Church in the original Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense according as the native Greeks did use the same to express their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or Christ, and there-
Acts xix. 32, 39, 41. fore is translated by the word *Assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly, It is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the
Acts vii. 38. Assembly of the people of God under the Law, and therefore
Heb. ii. 12. might be most fitly translated the *Congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, It hath been conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the Church did meet to perform their solemn and
Acts xi. 26. 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22. public services unto God; and some passages there are which seem to speak no less, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place[63]. Beside these few

62 'Hæ voces Ecclesiæ, ex qua habuit omnis Ecclesia initium,' *S. Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iii. *cap.* 12. [§. 5. p. 195.]

63 From these places St. Augustin did collect that Ἐκκλησία was taken in the Scriptures for the place of meeting, or the house of God, and came so to be frequently used in the language of Christians in his time: 'Sicut Ecclesia dicitur locus, quo Ecclesia congregatur. Nam Ecclesia homines sunt, de quibus dicitur, *Ut exhiberet sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam.* Hoc tamen vocari etiam ipsam domum orationum, idem Apostolus testis est, ubi ait, *Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum et bibendum? an Ecclesiam Dei contemnitis?* Et hoc quotidianus loquendi usus obtinuit, ut in Ecclesiam prodire aut ad Ecclesiam confugere non dicatur, nisi qui ad locum ipsum parietesque prodierit, vel confugerit, quibus Ecclesiæ congregatio continetur.' *Quæst. in Levit. lib.* iii. *cap.* 57. [§. 3. vol. iii. p. 516 E.] By these words it is certain that in St. Augustin's time they used the word *Ecclesia*, as we do now the *Church*, for a place set apart for the worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek Church did use Ἐκκλησία in the same sense, as

different acceptions, the Church in the language of the New Testament doth always signify a company of persons professing the Christian faith, but not always in the same latitude. Sometimes it admitteth of distinction and plurality; sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the Churches of God are diversified as many; sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

338 For first in general there are often mentioned *the Churches* by way of plurality, *the Churches of God, the Churches of the Gentiles, the Churches of the saints*[61]. In particular we find a few believers gathered together in the house of one single person, called a Church, as the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila[65], the Church in the house of Nymphas, the Church in the house of Philemon; which Churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to join in the worship of the same God.

Acts xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xiv. 34. 2 Cor. viii. 19, 23, 24. xi. 8, 28. xii. 13. Rev. xxii. 16. 1 Thess. ii. 14. 1 Cor. xi. 16. Rom. xvi. 4. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. Rom. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Col. iv. 15. Philem. 2. Gal. i. 22. Acts ix. 31. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19.

Again, When the Scripture speaketh of any country where the Gospel had been preached, it nameth always by way of plurality the Churches of that country, as the Churches of Judæa, of Samaria, and Galilee, the Churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Asia, the Churches of Macedonia. But notwithstanding there were several such

Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the persecution under Dioclesian, says the Christians μηδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι, εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* viii. *cap.* 1. [p. 376.] And St. Chrysostom; Εἰ γὰρ ἐκκλησίαν κατασκάψαι χαλεπὸν καὶ ἀνόσιον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ναὸν πνευματικόν· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐκκλησίας σεμνότερον. *Homil.* 26. *in Epist. ad Rom.* [§. 3. vol. ix. p. 715 B.] But it is not so certain that the Apostle used Ἐκκλησία in that sense, nor is it certain that there were any houses set apart for the worship of God in the Apostles' times, which then could be called by that name. For Isidorus Pelusiota expressly denies it, and distinguishes between Ἐκκλησία and Ἐκκλησιαστήριον, after this manner; Ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο ἐκκλησιαστήριον· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀμώμων ψυχῶν συνέστηκε, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ λίθων καὶ ξύλων οἰκοδομεῖται. And thus he proveth this distinction; Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄλλο ἐστὶ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἄλλο θυσία, καὶ ἄλλο θυμιατήριον, καὶ ἄλλο θυμίαμα, καὶ ἄλλο βουλευτήριον, καὶ ἄλλο βουλή· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ συνεδρεύουσι μηνύει, ἡ δὲ τοὺς βουλευομένους ἄνδρας, οἷς καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος καὶ ἡ σωτηρία ἀνήκει· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστηρίου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Then he concludes, that in the Apostles' times there were no Ἐκκλησιαστήρια; Ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων ὅτε ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκόμα μὲν χαρίσμασι πνευματικοῖς, ἔβρυε δὲ πολιτείᾳ λαμπρᾷ, ἐκκλησιαστήρια οὐκ ἦν. *Lib.* ii. *Epist.* 246. [p. 236 C.]

64 Thus Origen for the most part speaks of the Church in the plural number, Αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι.

65 St. Chrysostom observeth of Priscilla and Aquila, Οὕτω γὰρ ἦσαν εὐδόκιμοι, ὡς καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι, διά τε τοῦ πάντας ποιῆσαι πιστοὺς, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοῖς ξένοις αὐτὴν ἀνοῖξαι πᾶσιν. *Homil.* 30. *in Epist. ad Rom.* [§. 3. vol. ix. p. 741 C.]

Rev. i. 11. 1 Thess. ii. 14. 2 Cor. viii. 1. Gal. i. 2. 1 Cor. xiv. 34. 1 Cor. i. 2. Acts viii. 1. xi. 22. xiii. 1. xv. 3. xviii. 22. xx. 17. 2 Thess. i. 1. Col. iv. 16. Rev. ii. 8, 12, 18. iii. 1, 7, 14.

Churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such congregations in the notion of one Church: as when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, *Let your women keep silence in the Churches;* yet the dedication of his Epistle is, *Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth.* So we read not of the Churches, but the Church at Jerusalem, the Church at Antioch, the Church at Cæsarea, the Church at Ephesus, the Church of the Thessalonians, the Church of Laodicea, the Church of Smyrna, the Church of Pergamus, the Church of Thyatira, the Church of Sardis, the Church of Philadelphia[66]. From whence it appeareth that a collection of several congregations, every one of which is in some sense a Church, and may be called so, is properly one Church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in those great and populous cities where Christians were very numerous, not only all the several Churches within the cities, but those also in the adjacent parts, were united under the care and inspection of one bishop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following the number of the angels, that is, the rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.

Now as several Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the single governor of those many Churches, so all the Churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one supreme Governor of them all, and that one Governor is Christ the Bishop of our souls. Wherefore the Apostle speaking of that in which all Churches do agree, comprehendeth them all under the same appellation of one Church; and therefore often by the name of Church are understood 339
all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the Churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world[67]. For the single persons professing faith in Christ are members of the particular Churches in which they live, and all those

Matt. xvi. 18. 1 Cor. xii. 28; xv. 9. Gal. i. 13. Eph. i. 22; iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 25, 27, 29, 32. Phil. iii. 6. Col. i. 18, 24. Heb. xii. 23.

66 And thus after they grew yet far more numerous in the time of Clemens Bishop of Rome; Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. *Epist.* i. [p. 145.] So after him Ignatius; Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας. *Epist. ad Ephes.* [p. 43.] and, Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν. *Epist. ad Tral.* [p. 60.] And so the rest.

67 Of this as of one Church, Celsus calls the Christians τοὺς ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας. *Apud. Orig. lib.* v. [§. 59. vol. i. p. 623 B.]

particular Churches are members of the general and universal Church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the Church in the Creed which we believe, and which is in other Creeds expressly termed *one*[68], *I believe in one Holy Catholick Church.*

It will therefore be farther necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Church which is thus one, to consider in what that unity doth consist. And being it is an aggregation not only of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first Church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have been in a manner added and conjoined, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by St. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. These then were all built upon the same Rock, all professed the same faith, all received the same sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this Church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built upon the same Foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same sacraments, by performing the same devotions. Acts ii. 41, 42, 44, 47.

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the Church considered in itself, (beside that of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit,) relieth upon the original of it, which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, is not yet many, but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the Church is built, and that is Christ: *for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* And though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the 1 Cor. iii. 11.

68 So the Creeds of Epiphanius *in Ancorato*, Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. [§. 120, 121. vol. ii. pp. 122, 123.] So the Jerusalem Creed in St. Cyril. Thus the Nicene, with the additions of the Council of Constantinople, Μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Thus also the Alexandrian, as appeareth by those already quoted of Alexander, Arius, and Euzoius.

unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner-stone; whereby it comes to pass that such persons as are of the Church, being *fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord.* This *stone* was *laid in Zion for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation:* (there was the first Church built, and whosoever have been, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the unity of origination[69]) Our Saviour

Eph. ii. 19, 20, 21.

Isa. xxviii. 16.

[69] Tertullian speaking of the Apostles; 'Ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ cæteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt, et quotidie mutuantur, ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc et ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantæ Ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ, et Apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis; quæ jura non alia ratio regit quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio.' *De Præscr. Hæret. cap.* 20. [p. 208 D.] This is the Unitas originis which St. Cyprian so much insists upon; 'Ecclesia una est, quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur; quomodo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum; et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum: et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiæ largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, &c.' *S. Cyprian. de Unitate Eccles.* [p. 195.] 'Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: *Ego tibi dico*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam*, &c. Et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, *Pasce oves meas.*—Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat, *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos*, &c. tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, [unam cathedram constituit, et]* unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur.' *Ibid.* [p. 194.] 'Ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἄκρως τίμιον κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν ἐπαινεῖται, μίμημα ὂν ἀρχῆς τῆς μιᾶς. *S. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* vii. [c. 17. vol. ii. p. 899.] This is very much to be observed, because that place of St. Cyprian is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one head of the Church upon earth, and to shew that the Bishop of Rome is that one head by virtue of his succession to St. Peter; whereas St. Cyprian speaketh nothing of any such one head, nor of any such succession, but only of the origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ, that the unity might be expressed. For whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honour with St. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to St. Peter, to shew the unity of the Church which he intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles.

* [The words inclosed in brackets are omitted in the edition of Cyprian published in 1726, and the conclusion of the passage is read thus; 'proficiscitur, et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur.']

gave the same power to all the Apostles, which was to found the Church; but he gave that power to Peter, to shew the unity of the same Church.

340 Secondly, The Church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one faith. There is *one Lord*, and *one faith*, and that faith *once delivered to the saints*, which whosoever shall receive, embrace, and profess, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of believers become a Church by believing, they must also become one Church by believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one; if we look upon Christ, which is mediately one; if we look upon the Apostles united in one corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles, because they believe the doctrine which the Apostles preached, and the Apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner-stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they received from Christ; then they which believe the same doctrine delivered by Christ to all the Apostles, delivered by all the Apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church. And this is the unity of faith[70].

Eph. iv. 5. Jude 3.

Thirdly, Many persons and Churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same sacraments, the signs and

70 Of this doth Irenæus speak, delivering the sum or brief abstract of the material object of faith; Τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρειληφυῖα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν, ὡς προέφαμεν, ἡ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα· καὶ ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παραδίδωσιν, ὡς ἓν στόμα κεκτημένη. *Adv. Hæres. lib.* i. *cap.* 3. [c. 10. §. 2. p. 49.] Κατά τε οὖν ὑπόστασιν, κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν, κατά τε ἀρχὴν, κατά τε ἐξοχὴν, μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματι, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβυλῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* vii. [c. 17. vol. ii. p. 899.] This unity of faith followeth the unity of origination, because the true faith is the true foundation. 'Siqua est Ecclesia quæ fidem respuat, nec Apostolicæ prædicationis fundamenta possideat—deserenda est.——[Petra est Christus.]' *S. Ambros. in Luc.* [lib. vi. §. 68.] *cap.* 9. [vol. i. p. 1399 E.] Ἡ τοίνυν συνέχουσα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴ ἡ πίστις ἐστί. *S. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* ii. [c. 12.] St. Jerom on those words of Psalm xxiv. 6. *Hæc est generatio quærentium Dominum*, hath this observation; 'Superius singulariter dixit, *Hic accipiet benedictionem;* modo pluraliter, quia Ecclesia ex pluribus personis congregatur, et tamen una dicitur propter unitatem fidei.'

badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this commission, Matt. xxviii. 19. *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father,* Eph. iv. 5. *and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but *one Lord,* and *one faith,* so also there is but *one baptism;* and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, At the institution of the Lord's Supper, Christ commanded, saying, *Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this;* and all, by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. 1 Cor. x. 17. *For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all* 1 Cor. x. 2, 3, 4. *partakers of that one bread.* As therefore the Israelites *were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink,* and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons, and all Churches congregated in the name of Christ, 341 washed in the same laver of regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same Church. And this is the unity of the sacraments.

Fourthly, Whosoever belongeth to any Church is some way Eph. iv. 4. called; and all which are so, are *called in one hope of* their *calling:* the same reward of eternal life is promised unto every Gal. v. 5. person, and *we* all *through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.* They therefore which depend upon the same Titus i. 2. God, and worship him all for the same end, the *hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began,* having all the same expectation, may well be reputed the same Church. And this is the unity of hope.

Fifthly, They which are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members, howsoever different, yet being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastening and uniting nature; nor can we call those many, who Eph. iv. 3. *endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.* John xiii. 35. *By this,* said our Saviour, *shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.* And this is the unity of charity[71].

Lastly, All the Churches of God are united into one by the

[71] 'Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia ejus, et fides una, et plebs una in solidam corporis unitatem concordiæ glutino copulata.' *S. Cyprian. de Unitate Eccles.* [p. 202.]

unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation: as therefore there is no Church where there is no order, no ministry[72]; so where the same order and ministry is, there is the same Church. And this is the unity of regiment and discipline[73].

By these means and for these reasons, millions of persons and multitudes of congregations are united into one body, and become one Church[74]. And thus under the name of *Church* expressed in this Article, I understand a body, or collection of human persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in several places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the Church as such, which is here the object of our faith; it remaineth therefore that we next consider the existence of the Church, which is acknowledged in the act of faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, *I believe a Church*, it is not only an acknowledgment of a Church which hath been, or of a Church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say, *I believe in Christ dead*, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not: for Christ once died, but now is not dead. When I say, *I believe the resurrection of the body*, I

72 'Ecclesia non est, quæ non habet Sacerdotes.' *S. Hieron. adv. Lucifer.* [vol. ii. p. 194 D.] *Πάντες ἐντρεπέσθωσαν τοὺς διακόνους, ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς πατέρα, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων. Χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται. Ignat. Epist. ad Trall.* §. 3. [p. 22.] *Τό γε μὲν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὄνομα τὴν τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν πιστευσάντων ὑφαίνει πληθὺν, ἱερουργούς τε καὶ λαοὺς, ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ χεῖρα κατεζευγμένους. S. Cyril. Alex. ad Is. cap.* xlv. 17. [vol. ii. p. 616 C.] 'ubi interpres *ὑφαίνει* male transtulit *declarat*, quod est *ὑποφαίνει*; cum reddere oportuerit, *connectit*, aut *contexit*.'

73 'Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur; Ecclesia quoque una est, quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur.' *S. Cyprian. de Unitate Eccles.* [p. 195.] So he joins these two together; 'Cum sit a Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus.' *Epist. ad Antonianum.* [p. 73.]

74 These are all expressed by Tertullian; 'Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus; idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta; semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus.' *De Virg. veland. cap.* 2. [p. 173 D.] 'Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, et disciplinæ unitate, et spei fœdere.' *Apologet. cap.* 39. [p. 31 A.]

acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past; to what is to come, as still to come; to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past, when the Creed was made, must necessarily be always past, and so believed for ever; that which shall never come to pass until the end of the world, when this public profession of faith 34
shall cease, that must for ever be believed as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every age as being: and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church itself, as being, was the object of the faith of the Church believing.

The existence therefore of the Church of Christ, (as that Church before is understood by us,) is the continuation of it in an actual being, from the first collection in the Apostles' times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the Article, it will be necessary to prove that the Church, which our Saviour founded and the Apostles gathered, was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded only upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this Church, but what we have from him that built it. The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve itself for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the Church. Many particular Churches have been wholly lost, many candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue itself more or longer than others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the universal Church must also be subject of itself unto the same defectibility.

But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular Churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When Christ spake first particularly to St. Peter, he sealed his speech with a powerful promise of perpetuity, saying, *Thou art Peter, and*

Matt. xvi. 18.

upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. When he spake generally to all the rest of the Apostles to the same purpose, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost;* he added a promise to the same effect, *and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* The first of these promises assureth us of the continuance of the Church, because it is built upon a rock; for our Saviour had expressed this before, *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.* The Church of Christ is the house of Christ; for he hath *builded the house,* and is as a *Son over his own house, whose house are we;* and as *a wise man,* he hath built his house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall. The latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ[75]. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name* of Christ, there he is in the *midst of them,* and thereby they become a Church; for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore being Christ
343 doth promise his presence unto the Church, even to the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the Church, until that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed this is *the city of the Lord of hosts, the city of our God, God will establish it for ever*[76]; as the great Prophet of the Church hath said.

Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Matt. vii. 24, 25.

Heb. iii. 3, 6.

Matt. xviii. 20.

Ps. xlviii. 8.

75 'Non deserit Ecclesiam suam divina protectio, dicente Domino, *Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus,* &c.' *Leo Epist.* 31. [Ep. xlviii. vol. i. p. 536.] St. Augustin upon these words of Psalm ci. *Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi,* maketh the Church to speak these words; 'Quid est, quod nescio qui recedentes a me, murmurant contra me? Quid est, quod perditi me periisse contendunt? Certe enim hoc dicunt, Quia fui et non sum: *Annuncia mihi exiguitatem dierum meorum.* Non a te quæro illos dies æternos: illi sine fine sunt, ubi ero; non ipsos quæro: temporales quæro, temporales dies mihi annuncia: *Exiguitatem dierum meorum,* non æternitatem dierum meorum, *annuncia mihi.* Quamdiu ero in isto sæculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos qui dicunt, Fuit, et jam non est: propter illos qui dicunt, Impletæ sunt Scripturæ, crediderunt omnes gentes, sed apostatavit et periit Ecclesia de omnibus gentibus. Quid est hoc, *Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi?* Et annunciavit, nec vacavit ista vox. Quis annunciavit mihi, nisi ipsa via? Quomodo annunciavit? *Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque in consummationem sæculi.' Serm.* 2. *in Psal.* ci. [§. 8. vol. iv. p. 1105 E.]

76 'Forte ista civitas, quæ mundum tenuit, aliquando evertetur. Absit: *Deus fundavit eam in æternum.* Si ergo

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the Church hath been propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world. For those which are believers are the Church; and therefore if they do believe, they must believe there is a Church. And thus having shewed in what the nature of a Church consisteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetual and indefectible existence by virtue of the promises of Christ, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the Article, *I believe the Church*.

After the consideration of that which is the subject in this Article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof; which are two, sanctity and universality; the one attributed unto it by the Apostles, the other by the Fathers of the Church: by the first the Church is denominated Holy, by the second Catholick. Now the Church which we have described may be called holy in several respects, and for several reasons: first, in reference to the vocation by which all the members thereof are called and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation in the language of the Scriptures is a sanctification: and so the calling being holy, (for *God hath called us with an holy calling*,) the body which is separated and congregated thereby, may well be termed *holy*. Secondly, in relation to the offices appointed and the powers exercised in the Church, which by their institution and operation are holy, that Church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called *holy*. Thirdly, because whosoever is called to profess faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the Apostle, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity:* for those namers of the name, or named by the name, of Christ, are such as called on his name; and that was the description of the Church; as when Saul did persecute the Church, it is said he had *authority from the chief priests to bind all that called upon the name* of Christ; and when he *preached Christ in the synagogues, all that heard him said, Is not this he who destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem?* Being then all within the Church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this

2 Tim. i. 9.

2 Tim. ii. 19.

Acts ix. 14, 20, 21. Vide 1 Cor. i. 2.

eam Deus fundavit in æternum, quid times ne cadat firmamentum?' *S. August. Enar. in Psal.* xlvii. [§. 7. vol. iv. p. 420 B.]

obligation, the whole Church may be termed *holy*[77]. Fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a Church in God was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great design thereof was for the begetting and increasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which, without a previous sanctification, they can never approach, because *without holiness no man shall* ever *see God.* Heb. xii. 14.

For these four reasons, the whole *Church of God*, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed *holy*. But the Apostle hath also delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the Church taken in so great a latitude. *For*, saith he, *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water, by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.* Eph. v. 25, 26, 27. Now though
344 it may be conceived that Christ did love the whole Church, as it did any way contain all such as ever called upon his name, and did give himself for all of them; yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy, as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the great complex body of the universal Church, to find that Church to which this absolute holiness doth belong: and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the Church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holiness is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the Church is holy.

Where first we must observe that the Church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true faith of Christ, containeth in it not only such as do truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites, and profane. Many profess

77 Ὅτι γὰρ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἁγίων τὸ ἐξ ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ πολιτείας ἀρίστης συγκεκροτημένον ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ, δῆλόν ἐστι τοῖς σοφίας γευσαμένοις. *Isidor. Pelus. lib.* ii. *Epist.* 246. [p. 236 B.]

the faith, which have no true belief; many have some kind of faith, which live with no correspondence to the Gospel preached. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For *the kingdom of heaven is like unto a field* in which *wheat and tares grow together into the harvest; like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind;* like unto *a floor* in which is laid up *wheat* and *chaff;* like unto *a marriage-feast,* in which some have on the *wedding-garment,* and some not. This is that ark of Noah in which were preserved beasts clean and unclean. This is that *great house* in which *there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour*[78]. There are *many called,* of all which the Church consisteth, but there are *few chosen* of those which are called, and thereby within the Church. I conclude therefore, as the ancient Catholicks did against the Donatists[79], that within the Church, in the public profession and external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned: and that Church containing these of both

Matt. xiii. 24, 30, 47.

iii. 12. xxii. 11.

Gen. vii. 2.

2 Tim. ii. 20.

Matt. xxii. 14.

78 'Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites, aream Dei esse Catholicam Ecclesiam, et intra eam usque in finem sæculi frumento mixtas paleas contineri: hoc est, bonis malos sacramentorum communione misceri.' *Fulgent. ad Petrum, cap.* 43. [p. 530.] Matt. xxii. 10. 2 Tim. ii. 20. St. Jerom joins these two together: 'Arca Noæ Ecclesiæ typus:—ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita et in hac universarum et gentium et morum homines sunt: ut ibi pardus et hœdi, lupus et agni; ita et hic justi et peccatores, id est, vasa aurea et argentea, cum ligneis et fictilibus commorantur.' *Dial. adv. Lucifer.* [§. 22. vol. ii. p. 195 A.]

79 The opinion of the Donatists confuted by the Catholics is to be seen in St. Augustin's book, entituled *Breviculus Collationis.* Upon which reflecting in his book *Post Collationem,* he observes how they were forced, by the testimony of those Scriptures which we have produced, to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad; 'Ecce etiam ipsi veritate evangelica non aliud coacti sunt confiteri, qui malos occultos nunc ei permixtos esse dixerunt;' as the good and bad fish are taken in the same net, because it could not discern the bad from the good. And from thence he enforceth from their acknowledgment, that those which are apparently evil are contained in the same Church: 'Si enim Dominus propterea retibus bonos et malos pisces pariter congregantibus Ecclesiam comparavit; quia malos in Ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid ceperint retia nesciunt piscatores: propterea ergo et areæ comparata est, ut etiam manifesti mali bonis in ea permixti prænuntiarentur futuri. Neque enim palea quæ in area est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluctibus latet, quæ sic omnium oculis est conspicua, ut potius occulta sint in ea frumenta, cum sit ipsa manifesta.' *Lib. post Collat. cap.* 9, 10. [§. 13. vol. ix. p. 588 E, F.]

kinds may well be called *holy*, as St. Matthew called Jerusalem *the holy city*, even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that city a general corruption in manners and worship. Matt. iv. 5: xxvii. 53.

Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they pass out of this life, die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall
345 short of the glory unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the external communion of the Church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not only by an holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the Church; when the members of the Church remaining being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole Church be truly and perfectly holy.

Then shall that be completely fulfilled, that Christ shall *present unto himself a glorious Church*, which shall *be holy and without blemish*. Not that there are two Churches of Christ; one, in which good and bad are mingled together; another, in which there are good alone: one, in which the saints are imperfectly holy; another, in which they are perfectly such: but one and the same Church, in relation to different times, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly [80]. To conclude, the Church of God is Eph. v. 27.

[80] This was it which the Catholics answered to the Donatists, objecting that they made two distinct Churches; 'De duabus etiam Ecclesiis calumniam eorum Catholici refutarunt, identidem expressius ostendentes quid dixerint, id

universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same Church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it, by a real infused sanctity; the same is farther yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same Church shall hereafter be most completely holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it shall be at once perfected in holiness and completed in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

The next affection of the Church is that of universality, *I believe the holy CATHOLICK Church.* Now the word *Catholick*, as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed, (as we have already shewn,) but being inserted by the Church, must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient Fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not used by the Apostles[81], we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the primitive Fathers, and that as to several intents. For, first, they called the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, St. John, St. Jude, the Catholick Epistles[82], because when the Epistles written

est, non eam Ecclesiam quæ nunc habet permixtos malos alienam se dixisse a regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti; sed eandem ipsam unam et sanctam Ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram; nunc habere malos mixtos, tunc non habituram; sicut nunc mortalem quod ex mortalibus constaret hominibus, tunc autem immortalem, quod in ea nullus esset vel corpore moriturus: sicut non ideo duo Christi, quia prior mortuus postea non moriturus.' *S. August. Collat. tertii diei, cap.* 10. [§. 20. vol. ix. p. 564 G.]

[81] It was the ordinary objection of the schismatical Novatians, that the very name of *Catholics* was never used by the Apostles, and the answer to it by the Catholics was by way of concession; 'Sed sub Apostolis, inquies, nemo Catholicus vocabatur; Esto, sic fuerit, vel illud indulge, &c.' *Pacian. ad Sympronianum, Epist.* 1. [c. 3. p. 257 C.]

[82] So St. Jerom of St. James; 'Unam tantum scripsit Epistolam quæ de septem Catholicis est' [de Viris Illustr. vol. ii. p. 815.]: of St. Peter; 'Scripsit duas Epistolas quæ Catholicæ nominantur' [p. 814.]: of St. Jude; 'Judas frater Jacobi parvam quidem, quæ de septem Catholicis est, Epistolam reliquit.' [p. 819.] This therefore was the common title of these Epistles in St. Jerom's time among the Latins, and before among the Greeks, as appeareth by Eusebius: *Τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται· ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν· οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν. Hist. Eccles. lib.* ii. *cap.* 23. [p. 82.] The same was in use before the time of Eusebius, as appeareth by Dionysius bishop of Alexandria; *Ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* vii. *cap* 25. [p. 353.] and before him, as appeareth by Origen; *Δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα, ὃν καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ*

by St. Paul were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular cities, these were either sent to the Churches dispersed through a great part of the world, or directed to the whole Church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, we observe the Fathers to use the word *Catholick* for nothing
346 else but general or universal, in the originary or vulgar sense; as the Catholick resurrection is the resurrection of all men, the Catholick opinion the opinion of all men[83]. Sometimes it was used as a word of state, signifying an Officer which collected the Emperor's revenue in several provinces, united into one diocese; who, because there were particular officers belonging to the particular provinces, and all under him, was therefore called the *Catholicus*[84], as general Procurator of them all, from whence that title was by some transferred upon the Christian Patriarchs.

διὰ τούτων ὡμολόγησε. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* vi. *cap.* 25. [p. 290.] Thus anciently *Epistola Catholica* was used for a general Epistle; Καθολικαὶ δὲ ἐκλήθησαν, ἐπειδὰν οὐ πρὸς ἓν ἔθνος ἐγράφησαν, ὡς αἱ τοῦ Παύλου, ἀλλὰ καθόλου πρὸς πάντα. *Leont. de Sectis, act.* 2. [c. iv. Galland. vol. xii. p. 629 C.] and so continued, not only in relation to the Scriptures, but to the epistles of others, as Eusebius of Dionysius bishop of Corinth; Χρησιμώτατον ἅπασιν ἑαυτὸν καθιστὰς ἐν αἷς ὑπετυποῦτο καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολαῖς. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* iv. *cap.* 23. [p. 185.]

83 So Justin Martyr; Μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ, συνελόντι φάναι, αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν. *Dial. cum Tryph.* §. 81. [p. 179 C.] and Theophilus Antiochenus;—ὅτι δύνατός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι τὴν καθολικὴν ἀνάστασιν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων. *Ad Autol. lib.* i. [c. 13. p. 346 A.] So Tertullian uses *Catholice* for *ex toto*. 'Ab eo permittatur vel imperetur necesse est catholice fieri hæc, a quo ex parte.' *De Fuga in Pers. cap.* 3. [p. 537 D.] And for *generaliter*; 'Etsi quædam inter domesticos—disserebant, non tamen ea fuisse credendum est, quæ aliam regulam fidei superducerent, diversam et contrariam illi, quam catholice in medium proferebant.' *De Præscr. Hæret. cap.* 26. [p. 211 C.] 'Hæc itaque dispecta totum ordinem Dei judicis operarium, et (ut dignius dixerim) protectorem catholicæ et summæ illius bonitatis ostendunt.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* ii. *cap.* 17. [p. 390 B.] So he calleth Christ 'Catholicum Patris sacerdotem:' *lib.* iv. *cap.* 9. [p. 420 A.] Origen of Celsus,—καθολικῶς ἀποφηνάμενος Θεὸν οὐδένα πρὸς ἀνθρώπους κατεληλυθέναι, ἢ Θεοῦ παῖδα· which he expounds immediately by καθόλου λελεγμένον. *Lib.* v. [§. 2. vol. i. p. 578 E.] So he speaks of καθολικὸν Κέλσου ψεῦδος, [§. 8. p. 582 B.] and, ἐν τῷ καθολικῷ περὶ πάντων τῶν τὰ πάτρια τηρούντων ἐπαίνῳ. [§. 26. p. 596 E.] So Justin Martyr; Ἀμνηστίαν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοὺς τῆς καθολικῆς δόξης ἐνέβαλον. *De Monarch. Dei*, §. 1. [p. 36 C.]

84 We read in the old Glossary, Καθολικός, *Rationalis*, that is, the receiver of the imperial revenue; not that it signifies so much of itself, but because he was the general receiver, and so not from receiving or accounting, but for the generality of his accounts in respect of others who were inferior, and whose receipts and accounts were more particular; therefore he was called *Catholicus*, who by the Latins was properly styled *Procurator summæ rei*, or *Rationalis summarum*. Thus Constantine signified to Cæcilianus bishop of Carthage, that he had written to his Procurator general to deliver him monies: Ἔδωκα γράμματα πρὸς Οὔρσον τὸν διασημότατον καθολικὸν τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, καὶ ἐδήλωσα αὐτῷ ὅπως τρισχιλίους φόλλεις τῇ σῇ στερρότητι ἀπαριθμῆσαι φροντίσῃ. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* x. *cap.* 6. [p. 486.] And in the same manner to Eusebius:

When this title is attributed to the Church, it hath not always the same notion or signification; for when by the Church is understood the house of God, or place in which the worship of God is performed, then by the *Catholick Church* is meant no more than the common Church, into which all such persons as belonged to that parish in which it was built were wont to congregate. For where monasteries were in use, as there were separate habitations for men, and distinct for women, so were there also Churches for each distinct; and in the parishes, where there was no distinction of sexes, as to habitation, there was a common Church which received them both, and therefore called *Catholick*[85].

Again, When the Church is taken for the persons making 347
profession of the Christian faith, the *Catholick* is often added in opposition to heretics and schismatics, expressing a particular Church continuing in the true faith with the rest of the Church of God, as the Catholick Church in Smyrna, the Catholick Church in Alexandria[86].

Ἀπεστάλη δὲ γράμματα παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμερότητος πρὸς τὸν τῆς διοικήσεως καθολικὸν, ὅπως ἅπαντα τὰ πρὸς ἐπισκευὴν αὐτῶν ἐπιτήδεια παρασχεῖν φροντίσειεν. *Idem, de Vita Constant. lib.* iv. *cap.* 36. *et Socrat Hist. Eccles. lib.* i. *cap.* 9. [p. 35.] So Suidas; Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ παραβάτου πρὸς Πορφύριον καθολικόν, which is the 36th of his Epistles extant. This *Rationalis summarum* was by the Greeks expressed thus either by one word, Καθολικός, or by more to the same purpose. So Dio Cocceianus speaking of Aurelius Eubulus; Τοὺς γὰρ δὴ καθόλου λόγους ἐπιτετραμμένος, οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐκ ἐδήμευσε. *Excerp. lib.* 79. [c. 21.] So Porphyrius; Ὥστε καὶ Θαυμασίου τινὸς τοὔνομα ἐπεισελθόντος τοὺς καθόλου λόγους πράττοντος. *In Vita Plotin.* [p. 9 A.] So Dionysius of Alexandria speaketh of Macrianus, who was *Procurator summæ rei* to the Emperor Valerianus; Ὃς πρότερον μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων λεγόμενος εἶναι βασιλέως, οὐδὲν εὔλογον (alluding to λόγων), οὐδὲ καθολικὸν (alluding to καθόλου) ἐφρόνησεν, ἀλλ' ὑποπέπτωκεν ἀρᾷ προφητικῇ τῇ λεγούσῃ, οὐαὶ τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπουσιν· οὐ γὰρ συνῆκε τὴν καθόλου πρόνοιαν· οὐδὲ τὴν κρίσιν ὑπείδετο τοῦ πρὸ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι· διὸ καὶ τῆς μὲν καθολικῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας γέγονε πολέμιος. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* vii. c. 10. [p. 332.]

[85] Thus Ἐκκλησία καθολική is often to be understood, especially in the later Greeks, for the common or Parochial Church. As we read in Codinus [Corpus Hist. Byz. vol. xix.]: Ὁ Σακελλίου τὴν ἐνοχὴν ἔχων τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. *De Officiis Constant. cap.* 1. [p. 4.] And again, Ὁ Ἄρχων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἔχων τὴν ἐνοχὴν τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ προτροπῆς τοῦ Σακελλίου. *Ibid.* [p. 5.] So likewise Balsamon; Λέγεται Σακελλάριος ὁ τῶν μοναστηριῶν διοικητὴς, ὡς ὁ Σακελλίου ὑποκοριστικῶς ὁ τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν φροντιστής. *Lib.* vii. *Juris Græcorum.* [vol. i. p. 457.] Where appeareth a manifest distinction of the Monastic and the Catholick Churches. Hence Alexius, Patriarch of Constantinople, complaineth of such as frequented the private chapels, and avoided the common churches, describing those persons in this manner; Πατριαρχικοῖς σταυροπηγίοις ἢ καὶ ἐπισκοπικοῖς θαρροῦντες, τὰς καθολικὰς παραιτούμενοι, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ταύταις συνάξεων καταφρονοῦντες. *Lib.* iv. *Juris Græcorum.* [p. 255.]

[86] As the Smyrneans spake in Euse-

Now being these particular Churches could not be named Catholick as they were particular, in reference to this or that city in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called Catholick by their coherence and conjunction with that Church which was properly and originally called so[87]; which is the Church taken in that acception which we have already delivered. That Church which was built upon the Apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by

bius of Polycarpus; Γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 170.] So Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, in Epiphanius. Thus Gregory Nazianzen begins his own last will; Γρηγόριος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντίνου πόλει, in which he bequeaths his estate τῷ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ναζιανζῷ, and subscribes it after the same manner in words in which he began it, and so the rest of the bishops which subscribed as witnesses; Ἀμφιλόχιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἰκονίῳ.—Ὄπτιμος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.—Θεοδόσιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἰδῇ.—Θεόδουλος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Ἀπάμειαν.—Θεμίστιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Ἀδριανούπολιν. [Greg. Naz. vol. ii. pp. 201–204.] In the same manner speak the Latins; 'Eodem itaque tempore in ecclesia Hipponensi catholica Valerius sanctus episcopatum gerebat.' *Possidius de Vita August. cap.* 4. Thus any particular true Church is called the Catholick Church of the place in which it is; and all Churches which retain the Catholick faith are called Catholick Churches. As when the Synod of Antioch concluded their sentence against the Samosatenians thus,—καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι συμφωνοῦσιν ἡμῖν. According to which notion we read in Leo the Great, 'Ad venerationem Pentecostes unanimiter incitemur, exultantes in honorem Sancti Spiritus, per quem omnis Ecclesia Catholica sanctificatur, omnis anima rationalis imbuitur.' *Serm.* 1. *de Pentecost.* Whence where we read in the Synod of Ariminum, Εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐπίσκοποι συνήλθομεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ πίστις τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γνωρισθῇ, καὶ οἱ τἀναντία φρονοῦντες ἔκδηλοι γένωνται. *Epist. ad Constant. Imp.* [Socr. ii. 37. p. 140.] although in Athanasius, Theodoret, and Socrates, it be constantly written, τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, yet St. Hilary did certainly read it ταῖς καθολικαῖς ἐκκλησίαις, for it is thus translated in his fragments; 'Ut fides clarescret omnibus Ecclesiis Catholicis, et hæretici noscerentur.' *Fragm.* 8. [p. 1344 B.] From whence it came to pass, that in the same city heretics and Catholicks having their several congregations, each of which was called the Church, the congregation of the Catholicks was by way of distinction called the *Catholick Church.* Of which this was the old advice of St. Cyril of Jerusalem; Ἂν ποτε ἐπιδημῇς ἐν πόλεσι, μὴ ἁπλῶς ἐξέταζε ποῦ τὸ κυριακόν ἐστι· καὶ γὰρ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αἱρέσεις κυριακὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σπήλαια καλεῖν ἐπιχειροῦσι· μηδὲ ποῦ ἐστὶν ἁπλῶς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. *Catech.* 18. [§. 26. p. 297 D.] 'Ego forte ingressus populosam urbem hodie cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinariacos, Cataphrygas, Novatianos, et cæteros ejusmodi comperissem, qui se Christianos vocarent; quo cognomine congregationem meæ plebis agnoscerem, nisi Catholica diceretur?' *Pacian. ad Symp. Epist.* 1. [§. 3. p. 257 C.] 'Tenet postremo ipsum Catholicæ nomen, quod non sine causa inter tam multas hæreses sic ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit, ut cum omnes hæretici se Catholicos dici velint, quærenti tamen peregrino alicui, ubi ad Catholicam conveniatur, nullus hæreticorum vel basilicam suam vel domum audeat ostendere.' *S. August. cont. Epist. Fundamenti, cap.* 4. §. 5. vol. viii. p. 153 C.]

87 'Nonne appellatione propria decuit caput principale signari?' *Pacian. ad Symp. Epist.* 1. [§. 3.]

their baptizing, receiving continued accession, and disseminated in several parts of the earth, containing within it numerous congregations, all which were truly called Churches, as members of the same Church; that Church, I say, was after some time called the *Catholick Church*, that is to say, the name *Catholick* was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For being every particular congregation professing the name of Christ, was from the beginning called a Church; being likewise all such congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the Church; being these two notions of the word were different, it came to pass that for distinction sake at first they called the Church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the Catholick Church[88].

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the 348
name *Catholick* to the Church, to signify thereby nothing else but the whole or universal Church, yet those which followed did signify by the same that affection of the Church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole Church *Catholick*, meaning no more than the universal Church; but having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be universal, and in what that universality did consist.

[88] I conceive at first there was no other meaning in the word Καθολική, than what the Greek language did signify thereby, that is, *tota* or *universa*, as St. Austin; 'Cum dixisset, *de super contexta*, addidit, *per totum*. Quod si referamus ad id quod significat, nemo ejus est expers qui pertinere invenitur ad totum: a quo toto, sicut Græca indicat lingua, Catholica vocatur Ecclesia.' *Tract.* 118. *in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part ii. p.801 A.] The most ancient author which I find it in, (except Ignatius, "Οπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω· ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία· *Epist. ad Smyrn.* §. 8.) is Clemens Alexandrinus;—μόνην εἶναί φαμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Strom. lib.* vii. [c 17. vol. ii. p. 899.] But the Passion of Polycarpus written in the name of the Church of Smyrna, may be much ancienter, in which the original notion seemeth most clear; Ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Σμύρναν, τῇ παροικούσῃ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίαις, i. e. *omnibus totius Ecclesiæ paræciis. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib.* iv. *cap.* 15. [p. 162.] It was otherwise called in the same notion ἡ καθόλου. As Apollinarius* bishop of Hierapolis; Τὴν δὲ καθόλου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίαν βλασφημεῖν διδάσκοντος τοῦ ἀπηυθαδισμένου πνεύματος. *Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* v. *cap.* 16. [p. 230.] And Eusebius; Προήει δ' εἰς αὔξησιν καὶ μέγεθος, ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσα, ἡ τῆς καθόλου καὶ μόνης ἀληθοῦς ἐκκλησίας λαμπρότης. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* iv. *cap.* 7. [p. 149.] Καθολική then and ἡ καθόλου is the same, *the whole, general*, or *universal*.

* [The fragment preserved by Eusebius is anonymous, and certainly not written by Apollinarius. v. Vales. ad l.]

As far then as the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the Church delivered in the Scriptures, so far, I conceive, we may safely conclude that the Church of Christ is truly Catholick, and that the truly Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say, we *believe the Catholick Church.*

The most obvious and most general notion of this Catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the commission given to the builders of it, *Go teach all nations,* whereby they and their successors were authorized and empowered to gather congregations of believers, and so to extend the borders of the Church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the public worship of God was confined to one country. *In Judah* was *God known, and his name* was *great in Israel; in Salem* was *his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Sion. He shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.* The temple was the only place in which the sacrifices could be offered, in which the priests could perform their office of ministration; and so under the Law there was an inclosure divided from all the world besides. But God said unto his Son, *I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* And Christ commanded the Apostles, saying, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* Thus the Church of Christ, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend itself from the city of Jerusalem, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation crying to the Lamb, *Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.* This reason did the ancient Fathers render why the Church was called *Catholick*[89], and the nature of the Church is so described in the Scriptures.

Matt. xxviii. 19.

Ps. lxxvi. 1, 2. Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20.

Ps. ii. 8.

Mark xvi. 15. Luke xxiv. 47.

Rev. v. 9.

89 We have before observed of Arius and Euzoius, that naming the Catholick Church in their Creed, they gave withal the interpretation of it; Εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων. *Socrat. Hist. Eccles.*

Secondly, They called the Church of Christ the Catholick Church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles *into all truth*, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which teaching all the same, may well be called Catholick, from the universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it[90].

John xvi. 13.

349

Thirdly, The Church hath been thought fit to be called Catholick in reference to the universal obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of all conditions[91]; and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of all the evangelical commands[92].

lib. i. *cap.* 26. [p. 61.] St. Cyril of Jerusalem gives this as the first importance of the word; Καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται, διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων. *Catech.* 18. [§. 23. p. 296 A.] 'Ubi ergo proprietas Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationabilis et ubique diffusa?' *Optat. de Schism. Donatist. lib.* ii. [c. i. p. 29.] 'Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catholica; unde καθολική Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem terrarum diffunditur.' *S. August. Epist.* 170. [Epist. LII. 1. vol. ii. p. 119 A.] 'Ecclesia illa est, quam modo dixit unicam suam; hæc est unica catholica, quæ toto orbe copiosa diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo porrigitur.' *Idem, Epist.* 120. [Epist. CXL. 43. p. 438 B.] 'Si autem dubitas, quod Ecclesiam quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosissima dilatatur, hæc sancta Scriptura commendat,—multis te manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem auctoritate prolatis onerabo.' *Idem, cont. Crescon. lib.* i. *cap.* 33. [§. 39. vol. ix. p. 408 A.] 'Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa.' *Isidor.* [*Hispal.*] *Sentent. lib.* i. *cap.* 19. [p. 421 F.]

[90] This is the second interpretation delivered by St. Cyril: Καὶ διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλειπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα, περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων, ἐπουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων. *Catech.* 18. [§. 23.] '*Ecclesia*, Græcum nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur *Convocatio*, propterea quod omnes ad se vocet. Catholica (id est universalis) ideo dicitur, quia per universum mundum est constituta, vel quoniam Catholica, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem.' *Ivo. Decret. p.* iii. *cap.* 2. [c. 3. p. 73.]

[91] This is the third interpretation of St. Cyril: Καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσέβειαν ὑποτάσσειν, ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχομένων, λογίων τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν. *Catech.* 18. [§. 23. p. 296 B.]

[92] 'Si reddenda Catholici vocabuli ratio est, et exprimenda de Græco interpretatione Romana, Catholicus ubique unum, vel (ut doctiores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatorum scilicet Dei. Unde Apostolus, *Si in omnibus obedientes estis:* et iterum, *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius, peccatores constituti sunt multi, sic per dicto audientiam unius justi constituentur multi.* Ergo qui Catholicus, idem justi obediens.' *Pacian. ad Symp. Epist.* 1. [§. 4. p. 258 B.] 'Acutum aliquid tibi videris dicere, cum Catholicæ nomen non ex totius orbis communione interpretaris, sed ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum, atque omnium sacramentorum: quasi nos, etiamsi forte hinc sit appellata Catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cujus veritatis nonnullæ particulæ etiam in diversis inveniuntur hæresibus, hujus nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandum Ecclesiam in omnibus gentibus, et non

Fourthly, The Church hath been yet further called or reputed Catholick, by reason of all graces given in it[93], whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues are disseminated, all the works and words and thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.

In all these four acceptions did some of the ancient Fathers understand the Church of Christ to be Catholick, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this Catholicism, or second affection of the Church, consisteth generally in universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces, in the souls of men.

The necessity of believing the Holy Catholick Church appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first, that *the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved;* and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a Church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. *There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,* but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church[94]. As none

Acts ii. 47.

Acts iv. 12.

promissis Dei et tam multis tamque manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remansisse Rogatistas, qui Catholici recte appellandi sint, ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium sacramentorum.' *S. August. Epist.* xlviii. *cap.* 7. [Epist. XCIII. 23. vol. ii. p. 240 D.] Indeed this notion of the Catholick Church was urged by the Donatists as the only notion of it, in opposition to the universality of place and communion. For when the Catholicks answered for themselves, 'Quia Ecclesiæ toto orbe diffusæ, cui testimonium perhibet Scriptura divina, ipsi, non Donatistæ, communicant, unde Catholici merito et sunt et vocantur; Donatistæ autem responderunt, non Catholicum nomen ex universitate gentium, sed ex plenitudine sacramentorum institutum.' *Idem, Collat. tertii diei, cap.* 3. [vol. ix. p. 555 A.]

93 This is the fourth and last explication given by St. Cyril: *Διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν μὲν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶδος, τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελουμένων, κεκτῆσθαι δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομαζομένης ἀρετῆς, ἔν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς παντοίοις χαρίσμασι. Catech.* 18. [§. 23. p. 296 B.]

94 *Καθάπερ ἐν θαλάσσῃ νῆσοι εἰσὶν αἱ μὲν οἰκηταὶ καὶ εὔυδροι καὶ καρποφόροι, ἔχουσαι ὅρμους καὶ λιμένας, πρὸς τὸ τοὺς χειμαζομένους ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καταφυγάς· οὕτω δέδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ κόσμῳ κυμαινομένῳ καὶ χειμαζομένῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰς συναγωγὰς λεγομένας ἐκκλησίας ἁγίας, ἐν αἷς καθάπερ λιμέσιν εὐόρμοις ἐν νήσοις αἱ διδασκαλίαι τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσὶ, πρὸς ἃς καταφεύγουσιν οἱ θέλοντες σώζεσθαι. S. Theophil. Antioch. ad Autol. lib.*

were saved from the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt lived, but such as were within those habitations, whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of 350
the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made: so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the temple.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe the Church of Christ which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast ourselves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to cast those out which do belong to it; for if any
Matt. xviii. 17. *neglect to hear the Church*, saith our Saviour, *let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.* By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the church of God; and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his
John xx. 23. Apostles, upon whom he built his Church, *Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.* Again, a man may not only passively and involuntarily be ejected, but also may by an act of his own cast out or eject himself, not only by plain and complete apostasy, but by a defection from the unity of truth falling into some damnable heresy; or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable schism.

Thirdly, It is necessary to believe the Church of Christ to be holy, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution, and administration of the Church are holy: but, that there may be some real and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons

ii. [p. 360 A.] Μιᾷ δὲ προσήκειν ἐκκλησίᾳ τὴν σωτηρίαν ταύτην ἐπιστάμεθα, καὶ μηδένα τῆς καθολικῆς ἔξωθεν ἐκκλησίας καὶ πίστεως μετέχειν Χριστοῦ δυνάμενον, μηδὲ σώζεσθαι. *S. Chrysost. Hom.* 1. *in Pascha.* [inter Spuria. vol. viii. App. p. 252 E.]

abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness, the privileges of the Church prove the greatest disadvantages; and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not only vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding-garment; and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry, *Lord, Lord, open unto us,* while we are without oil in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness, when we confess that Church alone which is holy can make us happy. Matt. xxv. 11.

Fourthly, There is a necessity of believing the Catholick Church, because except a man be of that, he can be of none[95]. For being the Church which is truly Catholick containeth within it all which are truly Churches, whosoever is not of the Catholick Church, cannot be of the true Church. That Church alone which first began at Jerusalem on earth, will bring us to the Jerusalem in heaven; and that alone began there which always embraceth *the faith once delivered to the saints.* Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe *the holy Catholick Church.* Jude 3.

Having thus far explicated the first part of this Article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction what they ought to intend when they profess to believe *the holy Catholick Church.* For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much: I am fully persuaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ, by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto himself a Church, consisting of thousands of believing persons and numerous congregations, to which he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same unto the end of the world: so that by the virtue of his all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto,
351 and now is, and hereafter shall be, so long as the sun and moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same. This Church I believe in general holy in respect of the author, end, institution, and administration of it; particularly in the members here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy.

95 'Sola Catholica Ecclesia est, quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis; hoc domicilium fidei; hoc templum Dei, quo si quis non intraverit, vel a quo si quis exiverit, a spe vitæ, ac salutis æternæ alienus est.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 30. [vol. i. p. 323.]

I look upon this Church not like that of the Jews, limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of Christ, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well-pleasing, in the sight of God. And thus *I believe the Holy Catholick Church.*

The Communion of Saints.

THIS part of the Article beareth something a later date[96] than any of the rest, but yet is no way inferior to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the Creed will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as it is placed in the Creed. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words as the sense of the Creed, than what was then understood by the Church of God, when they were first inserted.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the original condition of those persons which received the Gospel, how they *were all together, and had all things common;* how they *sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men*

Acts ii. 44, 45.

96 These words, *Communionem Sanctorum,* were not in the Aquileian Creed expounded by Ruffinus; they were not mentioned by him, as being either in the Oriental or the Roman Creed. They were not in the African Creed expounded by St. Austin *De Fide et Symbolo;* not in the Creed delivered by Maximus Taurinensis; not in any of the Sermons of Chrysologus; not in any of the four books *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos* attributed to St. Austin; not in the 119th Sermon under his name, *De Tempore;* 'Cum dixerimus *Sanctam Ecclesiam,* adjungamus *Remissionem peccatorum.*' *Cap.* 8. [Serm. 213. vol. v. p. 942 E.] They are not in the Greek Creed in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, not in the old Latin Creed in the Oxford Library, not in that produced by Elipandus. We find them not in the old Greek Creeds, not in that of Eusebius given in to the Council of Nice, not in that of Marcellus delivered to the bishop of Rome, not in that of Arius and Euzoius presented to Constantine, not in either of the Creeds preserved in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, not in the Jerusalem Creed expounded by St. Cyril, not in that of the Council of Constantinople, not in that of Charisius given in to the Ephesine Council, not in either of the expositions under the name of St. Chrysostom. It was therefore of a later date, and is found in the Latin and Greek copy in Bennet College Library, and is expressed and expounded in the 115th and 181st Sermon *De Tempore,* attributed to St. Austin. [Serm. 241. vol. v. App. p. 395. and Serm. de Symbolo. vol. vi. App. p. 277.] *V. Paschasii Symbolum.*

as every man had need; how St. Paul urged *an equality, that* the *abundance* of some might *supply the want* of others, *as it* was *written, He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack:* we might well conceive that *the communion* (which word might be taken for *communication*) *of the saints,* may signify the great charity, bounty, and community among the people of God[97]. 2 Cor. viii. 14, 15.

But being that community, precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the Church, being I conceive this Article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past; and especially, being I think neither that custom, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church, when this communion of saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which is attributed to the saints both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves;
352 between them and others, as differing from them, either in their nature or their sanctity; between themselves, as distinct in person only, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who, or what kind of persons these are which are called *saints,* with whom beside themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the saints, they have communion; and lastly, in what the nature of that communion in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication *of the communion of saints.*

That we may understand what communion the saints have with others, it will be necessary first to consider what it is to be a saint, in what the true nature of saintship doth consist, by what the saints are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what communion the saints have with or among themselves, it will be farther necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true saints, and thence conclude the communion between them all.

I take it first for granted, that though the Greek word,

97 As Grotius upon that place of the Corinthians observes; 'Spectat et huc ea quam in Symbolo profitemur Sanctorum communio.' [vol. ii. p. 849.]

which we translate *saints*, be in itself as applicable to things, as persons[98]; yet in this Article it signifieth not *holy things*, but *holy ones*, that is, persons holy. Secondly, I take it also for granted, that the singular Holy One, the Holy One of Israel, the Fountain of all sanctity, the Sanctifier of all saints, is not comprehended in the Article, though the communion of the holy ones with that singular, eminent, and transcendent Holy One[99] be contained in it. Thirdly, I take it farther for granted, that the word in this Article, which we translate *saints*, is not taken in the original of the Creed, as it is often taken in the translation of the Old Testament, for the *sanctuary*[1], as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly, I take it also for granted, that although the blessed and holy angels are sometimes called in the Scriptures by the name of *saints*[2], yet

98 Κοινωνία ἁγίων may be as well understood in the neuter as the masculine; as Exod. xxviii. 38. Ἐξαρεῖ Ἀαρὼν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἁγίων· that *Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things*. So Levit. v. 15. Καὶ ἁμάρτῃ ἀκουσίως ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Κυρίου· xxii. 2. Καὶ προσεχέτωσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. 1 Chron. xxiv. 5. Ἄρχοντες τῶν ἁγίων, *the governors of the Sanctuary*, of which notion afterwards.

99 This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testament, קדוש ישראל ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ, which is also sometimes translated plurally by the LXX; as Is. xli. 16, בקדוש ישראל ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἰσραήλ. Jer. li. 5. מקדוש ישראל ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Ἰσραήλ· and if it were so taken, then Κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων would be the communion of God, as τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

1 Τὰ ἅγια is frequently used in the Scriptures for the *Sanctuary*; and then Κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων might be taken for the communion in all those things which belonged to the worship of God, as ἀκοινώνητος was a man excluded from all such communion.

2 The angels are not only called holy in the Scriptures by way of addition or epithet, as Πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι. Matt. xxv. 31. Μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων. Mark viii. 38. Luke ix. 26. Ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου. Acts x. 22. Ἐνώπιον τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων. Rev. xiv. 10. but also the Ἅγιοι, *holy ones*, or *saints*, taken substantively or singly signify sometimes the angels; as Deut. xxxiii. 2. ואתה מרבבת קדש *He came with ten thousands of saints*; which the Jerusalem Targum renders ועמיה ריבון מלאכין קדישין *And with him ten thousands of holy angels*, and Jonathan, ועמיה רבן ריבון מלאכין קדישין *And with him myriads of myriads of holy angels*. And although the LXX keep the Hebrew קדש, yet they understood the angels in that place, Σὺν μυριάσι Κάδης· [*Hesych.* Κάδης, ἁγιασμός] ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. So Job v. 1. *To which of the saints wilt thou turn?* Εἴ τινα ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὄψῃ. LXX. Thus in the vision of Daniel, He *heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake*: Dan. viii. 13. So Zech. xiv. 5. *And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee*. And thus it may very well be understood in the New Testament, 1 Thess. iii. 13. Ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, in correspondence to that, 2 Thess. i. 7. Ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. These are the Μυριάδες ἁγίαι in St. Jude 14. רבבת קדש *the myriads of angels*; and thus Κοινωνία ἁγίων should be *the communion of the angels*.

they are not those saints who are here said to have the communion, though the saints have communion with them.

For this part of the Article hath a manifest relation to the former, in which we profess to believe the holy Church; which Church is therefore holy, because those persons are such, or ought to be, which are within it, the Church itself being nothing else but a collection of such persons. To that confession is added this communion; but because though the Church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the Article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is therefore no doubt but the saints mentioned here are members of the Church of Christ, as we have described it, built upon the Apostles, laid upon the foundation
353 of their doctrine, who do not only profess the Gospel, but also are sanctified thereby.

The only question then remaining is, in what their sanctity or saintship doth consist, and (because, though they which are believers since our Saviour's death be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the Law, the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and the servants of God, were so called, and were truly named the saints of God) who were the persons which are capable of that denomination.

Now being God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern: (*Be ye holy*, as *I the Lord your God am holy: Be ye holy*, there is the command; as *the Lord your God is holy*, there is the rule:) being it is impossible that we should have the same sanctity which is in God, it will be necessary to declare what is this holiness which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called *saints*. Lev. xix. 2. xxi. 8.

The true notion of saints is expressed by Moses, both as to the subject, and the affection or qualification of it; for they are called by him *men of holiness;* such are the persons understood in this Article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now holiness in the first acception of it signifieth separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the Law were separated from common use, and applied to the service of God; and their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those terms, from an use and exercise Exod. xxii. 31. ואנשי קדש׃

profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of *saints*. The penmen of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of Israel as of an holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to a people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world, and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true inherent and actual sanctity; yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to that separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized in, the faith, give unto them all the name of *saints*, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being, though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect; therefore all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more than an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not only by an extrinsical denomination, but by a real and internal affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of Christ: by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a saint. Now by the tenure of the Gospel we shall find that those are truly and
1 Cor. i. 2. properly saints which are *sanctified in Christ Jesus:* first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for
1 John. v. 1. *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God:* by 354
Acts xv. 9. which they are purged, God himself *purifying their hearts by*
1 Cor. vi. 11. *faith,* whereby they are *washed, sanctified,* and *justified in the*
Eph. i. 13. *name of the Lord Jesus, in whom also after that* they *believe,* they are *sealed with the holy Spirit of promise.* Secondly, in respect

of their conversation: for *as he which hath called* them *is holy,* 1 Pet. i. 15.
so are they *holy in all manner of conversation: adding to* their *faith* 2 Pet. i. 5, 6, 7, 8.
virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity, that they may *neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Such persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient unto it; such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby; such as are sanctified by the holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy life, *perfecting holiness in the fear of God,* such persons, I say, are really and truly saints; and being of the Church of Christ, (as all such now must of necessity be,) are the proper subject of this part of the Article, *the communion of saints,* as it is added to the former, *the holy Catholick Church.* 2 Cor. vii. 1.

Now as these are the saints of the Church of Christ, from whence they were called the *Churches of the saints;* so there was never any Church of God but there were such persons in it as were saints: we read in the Psalms of *the congregation* and *the assembly of the saints*[3]; and Moses assured the people of Israel, that *all the saints* of God were *in* his *hand:* we read in the Prophets of *the saints of the Most High;* and at our Saviour's death *the bodies of* such *saints which slept arose.* Where again we may observe that they were saints while their bodies were in the grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of *the Saint of the Lord.* Such as are holy in their lives do not lose their sanctity, but improve it at their deaths; nor can they lose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. Ps. lxxxix. 5, 7. Deut. xxxiii. 3. Dan. vii. 25. Matt. xxvii. 52. Ps. cvi. 16.

Hence grows that necessary distinction of the saints on earth, and the saints in heaven; the first belonging to the militant, the second to the triumphant Church. Of the first the prophet David speaketh expressly, *Thou art my Lord; my goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the saints that are in the earth:* of these do we read in the Acts of the Apostles, to these did St. Paul direct his Epistles. Of the second doth the Apostles make that Ps. xvi. 2, 3.

3 Ps. lxxxix. 5. בקהל קדשים LXX, *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων.* lxxxix. 7. בסוד־קדשים *ἐν βουλῇ ἁγίων. Vulg. Lat. In Ecclesia* et *in concilio sanctorum.* Deut. xxxiii. 3. Dan. vii. 18, 21, 22, 25. St. Matt. xxvii. 52. 'Quis ignorat sub altera dispensatione Dei omnes retro sanctos ejusdem fuisse meriti cujus nunc Christiani sunt?' *S. Hieron. adv. Jovin. lib.* ii. [§. iv. vol. ii. p. 327 D.]

1 Cor. vi. 2. question, *Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?* And all those which were spoken of as saints then in earth, if truly such, and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, saints in heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a saint, that is, a man of holiness; having also distinguished the saints before and under the Gospel, (which difference is only observable as to this exposition of the Creed,) and again distinguishing the same saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also shewed that of all these, those saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the Church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those saints have this communion, and in what the communion which they have consists.

First then, The saints of God living in the Church of Christ have communion with God the Father: for the Apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have com-

1 John i. 3. munion with them, (*that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us,* saith St. John,)

Κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός. and did at the same time declare that their *communion* was *with the Father.* Wherefore being all the saints of God under the 355
Gospel receiving the doctrine of the Apostles have communion with them; being the communion of the Apostles was the communion with the Father: it followeth that all the saints of God under the Gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the Vine, so the Father is the Husbandman; and thus the saints partake of his care and inspection. As

Jam. ii. 23. *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God;* so all which are heirs of the faith of Abraham are made partakers of the same rela-

1 John iii. 1. tion. Nor are we only friends, but also sons; for *behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.* Thus must we acknowledge that the saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the

2 Pet. i. 4. Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. *great and precious promises* given unto them, they *become partakers of the divine nature.*

Secondly, The saints of God living in the Church of God have communion with the Son of God: for, as the Apostle said,

1 John i. 3. *our communion is with the Father and the Son;* and this connexion

is infallible, because *he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son;* and our Saviour prayed for all such as should *believe on* him *through the word* of the Apostles, *that they might be one, as the Father is one in* him, *and* he *in the Father, that they also may be one in* both: *I in them,* saith Christ, *and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.* This communion of the saints with the Son of God is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our sins, and the curse due unto them; while we all *have received of his fulness, grace for grace;* and are all called to the *fellowship of his sufferings,* that we may *be conformable to his death.* What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs, of the bridegroom and the spouse; what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the vine, that is the communion of saints with Christ. For God hath *called* us *unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.*

2 John 9. John xvii. 20, 21, 23. John i. 16. Phil. iii. 10. 1 Cor. i. 9. Κοινωνία τοῦ Υἱοῦ.

Thirdly, The saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost: and the Apostle hath two ways assured us of the truth thereof, one rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, *if* there be *any fellowship of the Spirit;* the other devoutly, praying for it, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.* The saints are therefore such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost; for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for hereby do we become the sons of God, in that we *have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby* we *cry, Abba, Father;* and thereby do we become coheirs with Christ, in that *because* we *are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into* our *hearts, crying, Abba, Father; so that* we *are no more servants, but sons; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ.* This is the communion which the saints enjoy with the three Persons of the blessed Trinity; this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when *the Lord appeared unto him,* and *three men stood by him:* for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, *If any man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father, and of

Phil. ii. 1. Κοινωνία Πνεύματος. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Rom. viii. 15. Gal. iv. 6, 7. Gen. xviii. 1, 2. John xiv. 23.

God the Son; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting
Rom. viii. 9. where those two are inhabiting; for *if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.* The Spirit therefore with the
1 Cor. iii. 16. Father and the Son inhabiteth in the saints; for *know ye not,* saith the Apostle, *that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?*

Fourthly, The saints of God in the Church of Christ have 356
communion with the holy angels. They who did foretell the birth of John the forerunner of Christ, they who did annunciate unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world, they who sung a glorious hymn at the nativity of the Son of God, they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom, they who appeared unto Christ from heaven in his agony to strengthen him, they who opened the prison-doors and brought the Apostles forth, they who at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetual
Heb. i. 14. relation to the children of God. Nay, *are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?* They have a particular sense of our condition, for Christ
Luke xv. 10. hath assured us that *there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the angels, who are all the angels, that is, the messengers, of God, are yet called the angels of men, according to the admonition of
Matt. xviii. 10. Christ, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

Thus far have we considered *the communion of saints* with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God, and his holy angels, while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them.

Fifthly, therefore, The saints of God, while they are of the Church of Christ on earth, have some kind of communion with those men which are not truly saints. There were not hypocrites among the Jews alone, but in the Church of Christ many cry, *Lord, Lord,* whom he knoweth not. The tares have the privilege of the field, as well as the wheat; and the bad fish of the net, as well as the good. The saints have communion with

hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a saint and hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same open profession of faith, both agree in the acknowledgment of the same principles of religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread, and drink the wine, which Christ hath appointed to be received: but the hypocrite doth not communicate with the saint in the same saving grace, in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit; for then he were not an hypocrite, but a saint: a saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking infidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godliness; for then he were not a saint, but an hypocrite. Thus the saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness, and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The Apostle's command runneth thus, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness*[4]; and again, *Be not partakers of other men's sins*: and a voice from heaven spake concerning Babylon, *Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins.* To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Eph. v. 11. 1 Tim. v. 22. Rev. xviii. 4.

357 Having thus considered those who differ from the saints of God; first, in respect of their humanity, as they are men; secondly, in reference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness: we are now to consider such as differ either only in person, as the saints alive; or in present condition also, as the saints departed.

Sixthly, therefore, The saints of God living in the Church of Christ have communion with all the saints living in the same

4 Ephes. v. 11. Μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις. 1 Tim. v. 22. Μὴ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις. Rev. xviii. 4. Ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις. 'Duobus modis non te maculat malus; si non consentias, et si redarguas:—Communicatur, quippe, quando facto ejus consortium voluntatis vel approbationis adjungitur. Hoc ergo nos admonens Apostolus ait, *Nolite communicare operibus infructuosis tenebrarum—magis autem et redarguite.*' *S. August. de Verbis Dom. Serm.* xviii. cap. 18. [§. 19. vol. v. p. 479 B.]

1 John i. 7. Κοινωνία μετ' ἀλλήλων.

Church. *If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another;* we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, we are all endued with the graces of the same Spirit, all united with the same mutual love and affection,

Eph. iv. 3.

keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; all engrafted into the same stock, and so receiving life from the same root;

Col. ii. 19.

all *holding the* same *head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* For in the philosophy of the Apostle, the nerves are not only the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head; and being the head of the body is Christ, and all the saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

Lastly, The saints of God living in the Church of Christ, are in communion with all the saints departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God[5]. Jerusalem sometimes is taken for the Church on earth, sometimes for that part of the Church which is in heaven, to shew that as both are represented by one, so both are but one city of God. Wherefore thus doth the Apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian faith,

Heb. xii. 22, 23, 24.

Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant. Indeed the communion of the saints in the Church of Christ with those which are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the saints alive. For if I have communion with a saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mystical union between Christ and his Church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the Head,

5 This is that part of the communion of saints which those of the ancients especially insisted upon, who first took notice of it in the Creed. '*Sanctorum Communionem*, i. e. cum illis sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt, societate et spei communione teneamur.' *Serm. de Temp.* clxxxi. *cap.* 13.* 'Et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Jesu Christo.' *Præf. Pass. S. Perpetuæ.*

* [This is not a work of Augustin. v. Op. vol. vi. Append. p. 282 E.]

is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mystical union, no breach of the spiritual conjunction; and consequently there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the saint departed, before his death, had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the faith, receiving the sacraments together; which being in things only external, as they were common to them both, and all such external actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loseth all communion with the saint departing, and the saints surviving cease to have farther fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But being the true and unfeigned holiness of man, wrought by the powerful influence of the Spirit of God, not only remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internal holiness was the true communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.

358 This communion of the saints in heaven and earth, upon the mystical union of Christ their head, being fundamental and internal, what acts or external operations it produceth, is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity, is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the Article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion, as to the saints of heaven, than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on their side: and what is now taught by the Church of Rome, is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation[6].

6 We have already produced the words of the 181st Sermon *De Tempore* concerning hope. In the same we find also that of imitation; 'Si igitur cum

The necessity of the belief of this *communion of saints* appeareth, first, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holiness of life. *If we walk in the light, as* God *is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.* But *if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?* When Christ sent St. Paul to the Gentiles, it was *to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in* Christ. Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought *meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.* Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

1 John i. 6, 7.

2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

Acts xxvi. 18.

Col. i. 12.

Secondly, The belief of *the communion of saints* is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and cheerful acknowledgment of so great a benefit. We cannot

sanctis in æterna vita communionem habere volumus, de imitatione eorum cogitemus. Debent enim in nobis aliquid recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignentur Domino supplicare.' *cap.* 13. [vol. vi. App. p. 282 E.] 'Hæc sunt vestigia quæ nobis sancti quique revertentes in patriam reliquerunt, ut illorum semitis inhærentes sequeremur ad gaudia.' *Ibid.* Beside this imitation, he addeth their desires and care for us below; 'Cur non properamus et currimus, ut patriam nostram videre possimus? Magnus illic charorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum, frequens nos et copiosa turba desiderat, jam de sua incolumitate secura, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita.' *Ibid.* Of the venerable esteem we ought to have of them, speaks Eusebius Gallicanus; 'Credamus et *sanctorum communionem;* sed sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore veneremur.' And again; 'Digne venerandi sunt, dum Dei nobis cultum, et futuræ vitæ desiderium, contemptu mortis insinuant.' *De Symb. Homil.* 2. [p. 555 E.] Thus far anciently they which expounded this article: but the late exposition of the Church of Rome runneth thus; 'Non solum Ecclesia, quæ est in terris, communicat bona sua cum omnibus membris sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia Ecclesiæ, quæ est in Purgatorio, et Ecclesia, quæ est in cœlis, communicat orationes et merita sua cum Ecclesia, quæ est in terris.' *Bellarm. in Symb.* [Art. ix. vol. vii. p. 1227 B.] where the communication of the suffrages of the saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communication of the merits of the saints in heaven to the saints on earth, are novel expositions of this article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his explication of the Creed, much less to be found in any of the ancienter expositors of it.

but acknowledge that they are *exceeding great and precious promises*, by which we become *partakers of the divine nature*. *What am I?* said David, *and what is my life, that I should be son-in-law to the king?* What are we the sons of men, what are they which are called to be saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? St. Philip the Apostle said unto our Saviour, *Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth;* whereas he hath not only shewn us, but come unto us with the Father, and dwelt within us by his Holy Spirit; he hath called us to the fellowship of the angels and archangels, of the cherubins and seraphins, to the glorious company of the Apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, to the noble army of martyrs, to the Holy Church militant on earth, and triumphant in heaven.

2 Pet. i. 4. 1 Sam. xviii. 18. John xiv. 8.

359

Thirdly, The belief of *the communion of saints* is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those which live, and a reverent respect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoined to him. Now no conjunction natural can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape and feature will create a kindness, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoin affections, what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same Spirit? And if all the saints of God living in communion of the Church deserve the best of our affections here on earth, certainly when they are dissolved and with Christ, when they have been blessed with a sight of God, and rewarded with a crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us, who are here to wait upon the will of God, expecting when such a happy change shall come.

Fourthly, This tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our brother is the foundation of our duty towards man, and in the language of the Scriptures whosoever is another is our brother; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy and kindness unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those, who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God, to do good unto such as appear

to be led by the same Spirit; for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of man's compassion; if they communicate with them in things spiritual and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things as are temporal and carnal[7]?

To conclude, Every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the Article, in which he professeth to believe *the communion of saints;* for thereby he is conceived to express thus much: I am fully persuaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the word and sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the saints on earth as the living members of Christ; nor is this union separated by the death of any; but as Christ in whom they live is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the saints which from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe *the communion of saints.*

ARTICLE X. 360

The Forgiveness of Sins.

THIS Article hath always been expressly contained and acknowledged in the Creed, as being a most necessary part of our Christian profession[8]; and for some ages it immediately followed

7 Κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου· οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀφθάρτοις κοινωνοί ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς φθαρτοῖς; *Barnabæ Epist. cap.* 19. [p. 52.]

8 Therefore Carolus Magnus in his Capitular, *lib.* iii. *cap.* 6. inveighs against Basilius the bishop of Ancyra, because in his confession of faith, which he delivered in the second Council of Nice, (*Act.* i.) he omitted the remission of sins, which the Apostles in so short a compendium as the Creed would not omit; 'Hanc Apostoli in collatione fidei, quam ab invicem discessuri quasi quan-

the belief of *the holy Church*[9], and was therefore added immediately after it, to shew that remission of sins was to be obtained in the Church of Christ[10]. For being the Creed at first was made to be used as a confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose name baptism was administered; they propounded unto them *the holy Church*, into which by baptism they were to be admitted, and *the forgiveness of sins*, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some Creeds it was particularly expressed, *I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins*[11].

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe *forgiveness of sins*

dam credulitatis et prædicationis normam statuerunt, post confessionem Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti posuisse perhibentur; et in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per prophetam dictum est, *Verbum abbreviatum faciet Dominus super terram*, hanc ponere minime distulerunt, quia sine hac fidei sinceritatem integram esse minime perspexerunt. Nec cohibuit eos ab ejus professione illius Symboli brevitas, quam exposcebat sacræ fidei integritas, tantique doni veneranda sublimitas.'

9 'Concordant autem nobiscum angeli etiam nunc, cum remittuntur nostra peccata. Ideo post commemorationem sanctæ Ecclesiæ in ordine Confessionis ponitur remissio peccatorum: per hanc enim stat Ecclesia quæ in terris est; per hanc non perit, quod perierat et inventum est.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 64. [§. 17. vol. vi. p. 220 B.] And to this purpose it is that in his book *De Agone Christiano*, passing from one article to another with his general transition, after that of the Church, he proceedeth with these words; 'Nec eos audiamus, qui negant Ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere.' *cap.* 31. [§. 33. vol. vi. p. 260 F.] So it followeth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former article of the communion of saints.

10 *Orig. Homil.* 2. *in Genesin.* [vol. ii. p. 63.] 'Sanctam Ecclesiam teneat—in qua et remissio peccatorum et carnis resurrectio prædicabatur.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 39. p. ccxxvi.] 'Sed neque de ipsis criminibus quamlibet magnis remittendis in sancta Ecclesia Dei misericordia desperanda est.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 65. [§. 17. vol. vi. p. 220 E.] '*In remissionem peccatorum.* Hæc in Ecclesia si non esset, nulla spes esset: remissio peccatorum si in Ecclesia non esset, nulla futuræ vitæ et liberationis æternæ spes esset. Gratias agimus Deo, qui Ecclesiæ suæ dedit hoc donum.' *Auctor Serm.* cxix. *de Temp. c.* 8. [Epist. CCXIII. 8. vol. v. p. 942 B.] 'Quia singuli quique cœtus hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, et suam esse catholicam Ecclesiam putant; sciendum est, illam esse veram, in qua est [religio,] confessio, et pœnitentia, quæ peccata et vulnera, quibus est subjecta imbecillitas carnis, salubriter curat.' *Lactan. de Vera Sap. lib.* iv. *cap.* 30. [p. 324.]

11 These are the words of the Constantinopolitan Creed; 'Ομολογῶ ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Before which Epiphanius in his lesser Creed, 'Ομολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· in the larger, Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας. *In Ancorato*, §. 120, 121. [p. 123 A, 124 C.] St. Cyril both these together; Εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. *Catech.* 18. [§. 22. p. 295 C.] 'Credo unum Baptismum in remissionem omnium peccatorum.' *Pelegrinus Laureac. Episc.* [p. 424 C.] 'Credimus unum Baptisma in remissionem omnium peccatorum in sæcula sæculorum.' *Symb. Æthiop.*

is to be obtained in the Church of Christ. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to declare what is the nature of remission of sins, in what that action doth consist; secondly, to shew how so great a privilege is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the Church. That we may understand the notion of *forgiveness of sins*, three considerations are required; first, What is the nature of sin, which is to be forgiven; secondly, What is the guilt or obligation of sin, which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, What is the remission itself, or the loosing of that obligation.

As the power of sin is revealed only in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the Apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find
1 John iii. 4. even in them a proper definition of sin. *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law*, saith St. John, and then rendereth this reason of that universal assertion, *for sin is the transgression of the law*. Which is an argument drawn from the definition of sin; for he saith not, *Every sin is the transgression of the law*, which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition only, to have proved the universality of his assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, *sin is the transgression of the law*, which is sufficient, speaking it by way of definition[12]. And it is 361
elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the Apostle
Rom. iv. 15. affirming, that *the law worketh wrath*, that is, a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, *for where no law is, there is no transgression*. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is sin[13]: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that

[12] The manner of the Apostle's speech is also to be observed, having an article prefixed both to the subject and the predicate; as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be: 'Η ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. 1 St. John iii. 4.

[13] 'Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ, et cœlestium inobedientia præceptorum?' *S. Ambros. de Paradiso, cap.* 8. [§. 39. vol. i. p. 161 E.] 'Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem.' *S. August. cont. Faust. lib.* xxii. *cap.* 27. [vol. viii. p. 378 F.] 'Quid verum est, nisi et Dominum dare præcepta, et animas liberæ esse voluntatis, et malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem a Dei præceptis?' *Idem, de Fide cont. Manich. cap.* 10.* 'Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos, ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam nec peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubetur, ut non sit.' *Idem, de Pec. Meritis et Rem. lib.* ii. *cap.* 16. [§. 23. vol. x. p. 52 F.]

* [This is not a work of Augustin. v. Op. vol. viii. Append. p. 27 A.]

law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man, having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the law is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary to the prohibition of the law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by actions committed against the law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul, to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of sin.

The second particular to be considered is the obligation of sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person; which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. It is the nature of laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission pass away in the acting or performing of them; so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is passed, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is passed in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, pass away; so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinned, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin itself do pass away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never pass which by committing was contracted. He which but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit

that sin; but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, and obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery[14].

This debt or obligation to punishment is not only necessarily 362
resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor only generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousness, but is yet more particularly
Gen. iv. 7. represented in the word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how *sin lieth at the door.* Our blessed Saviour thus taught his Disciples,
Matt. v. 22. *Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be liable*[15]

14 This obligation unto punishment, remaining after the act of sin, is that *Peccati reatus* of which the Schools, and before them the Fathers spake. The nature of this *Reatus* is excellently declared by St. Austin, delivering the distinction between actual and original sin: 'In eis qui regenerantur in Christo, cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium peccatorum, utique necesse est, ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis concupiscentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum, sicut dixi, non imputetur. Nam sicut eorum peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum fiunt prætereunt, reatus tamen manet, et nisi remittatur, in æternum manebit; sic illius [concupiscentiæ], quando remittitur, reatus aufertur. Hoc est enim non habere peccatum, reum non esse peccati. Nam si quisquam, verbi gratia, fecerit adulterium, etiamsi nunquam deinceps faciat, reus est adulterii, donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur. Habet ergo peccatum; quamvis illud quod admisit jam non sit, quia cum tempore quo factum est prætereiit. Nam si a peccando desistere, hoc esset non habere peccata, sufficeret ut hoc nos moneret Scriptura; *Fili, peccasti? non adjicias iterum:* non autem sufficit, sed addidit, *et de pristinis deprecare, ut tibi remittantur.* Manent ergo, nisi remittantur. Sed quomodo manent, si præterita sunt, nisi quia prætereierunt actu, manent reatu?' *S. August. de Nupt. et Concup. lib.* i. *cap.* 26. [§. 29. vol. x. p. 294 G.] 'Ego de concupiscentia dixi, quæ est in membris repugnans legi mentis, quamvis reatus ejus in omnium peccatorum remissione transierit: sicut e contrario sacrificium idolis factum, si deinceps non fiat, prætereiit actu, sed manet reatu, nisi per indulgentiam remittatur. Quiddam enim tale est sacrificare idolis, ut opus ipsum cum fit prætereat, eodemque prætorito reatus ejus maneat venia resolvendus.' *Idem, cont. Julian. Pelag. lib.* vi. *cap.* 19. [§. 60. vol. x. p. 696 C.]

15 Ἔνοχος ἔσται is the word used here, which is translated, *shall be in danger*, but is of a fuller and more pressing sense, as one which is a debtor, subject, and obliged to endure it. Ἔνοχος, χρεώστης, ὑπεύθυνος, ὑποκείμενος. *Hesych.* Ἔνοχος, ὑπαίτιος. *Suid.* Where by the way is to be observed a great mistake in the Lexicon of Phavorinus, whose words are these; Ἔνοχος, ὑπεύθυνος, χρεώστης. Ἔνοφος, ὑπαίτιος, Τίμαιος. The first taken out of Hesychius, the last out of Suidas, corruptly and absurdly; corruptly ἔνοφος for ἔνοχος, absurdly Τίμαιος is added either as an interpretation of ἔνοχος, or as an author which used it; whereas Τίμαιος in Suidas is only the first word of the sentence, provided by Suidas for the use of ἔνοχος in the signification of ὑπαίτιος. Agreeable unto Hesychius is that in the Lexicon of St. Cyril, Ἔνοχος, *Obnoxius, reus, obligatus.* And so in this place of St. Matthew, the old Latin translation, Reus erit judicio. As in Virgil;

Constituam ante aras voti reus.——
Æneid. V. 237.

Servius; '*Voti reus.* Debitor: unde vota solventes, dicimus absolutos. Inde est, *Ecl.* v. 80. *Damnabis tu quoque votis;* quasi reos facies.' So the Syriac; מחיב הו לדינא from חיב *obligatum, debitorem, reum esse.* For indeed the word ἔνοχος

(obnoxious, or bound over) *to the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be liable* (obnoxious, or bound over) *to the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable* (obnoxious, or bound over) *to hell fire.* So saith our Saviour again, *All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is liable* (obnoxious, or bound over) *to eternal damnation.* Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of sin and obligation to eternal punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it; and the taking off that liableness, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed, in our Saviour's expression, *He hath never forgiveness, but is liable to eternal death.* Mark iii. 28, 29.

God, who hath the sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetual and universal rule of human actions; which law whosoever doth violate, or transgress, and thereby sin, (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law,) is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act remaineth; that is, the person who committed it continueth still a debtor to the vindictive justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

The third consideration now followeth, What is *the forgiveness*

among the Greeks, as to this matter, hath a double signification; one in respect of the sin, another in respect of the punishment due unto sin. In respect of a sin, as that in Antiphon; Μὴ ὄντα φονέα, μηδὲ ἔνοχον τῷ ἔργῳ. *Orat.* 14, 15. [De Cæde Herodis. §. 87.] and that in Aristotle; Ἔνοχον ἔφησεν ἱεροσυλίας ἔσεσθαι· *Œcon. lib.* ii. [c. xxi. §. 1.] and that in Suidas, taken out of Polybius, [xii. 23.] Τίμαιος κατὰ τοῦ Ἐφόρου πεποίηται καταδρομὴν, αὐτὸς ὢν [ἐπὶ] δυσὶν ἁμαρτήμασιν ἔνοχος· τῷ μὲν, ὅτι πικρῶς κατηγόρει τῶν πέλας ἐπὶ τούτοις οἷς αὐτὸς ἔνοχός ἐστι. In respect of the punishment of a sin, he is ἔνοχος ἀρᾷ, who is obnoxious to the curse, and ἔνοχος ἐπιτιμίοις, obnoxious to the punishment. Ἐμπολίνιμος, ἐμπολίνιος, τούτεστιν, ἔνοχος ποινῇ, οἷον ἐφ' οἷς ἥμαρτε δοὺς τιμωρίαν, saith Suidas. Thus Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστί, Matt. xxvi. 66. חיב הוא מותא is not, in the intention of the Jews, *he is in danger of death*, but *he deserveth death*, and he ought to die; he is κατάδικος, by their sentence, as far as in them lay, condemned to die. Τί οὖν ἐκεῖνοι: ἔνοχός ἐστι θανάτου· ἵν' ὡς κατάδικον λαβόντες, οὕτως τὸν Πιλάτον λοιπὸν ἀποφήνασθαι παρασκευάσωσιν· ὁ δὴ κἀκεῖνοι συνειδότες φασὶν, Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν· αὐτοὶ κατηγοροῦντες, αὐτοὶ καταδικάζοντες, αὐτοὶ ψηφιζόμενοι, πάντα αὐτοὶ γινόμενοι τότε. *S. Chrysost. ad locum.* [Hom. LXXXIV. §. 3. vol. vii. p. 801 A.]

of sin, or in what *remission* doth consist: which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God; and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion or nature of this act, or how God doth forgive a sinner, is not so easy to determine: nor can it 363 be concluded out of the words themselves which do express it, the niceties of whose originations will never be able to yield a just interpretation[16].

For although the word signifying *remission* have one sense among many other which may seem proper for this particular concernment, yet because the same word hath been often used

16 The word used in the Creed is Ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, and that generally likewise in use in the New Testament. But from thence we cannot be assured of the nature of this act of God, because ἀφιέναι and ἄφεσις are capable of several interpretations. For sometimes ἀφιέναι is *emittere*, and ἄφεσις *emissio*. As Gen. xxxv. 18. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀφιέναι αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχήν, not *cum demitteret eam anima*, as it is translated, but *cum emitteret ea animam*, i. e. *efflaret*; as Ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, *emisit spiritum*: Matt. xxvii. 50. So Gen. xlv. 2. Καὶ ἀφῆκε φωνὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ, not *dimisit*, but *emisit vocem cum fletu*, as Ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην, *emissa voce magna*: Mark xv. 37. In the like manner Ἀφέσεις θαλάσσης are *emissiones maris*; 2 Sam. xxii. 16. as Ἀφέσεις ὑδάτων, Joel i. 20. to which sense may be referred that of Hesychius; Ἄφεσιν, ὕσπληγγα. And this interpretation of ἄφεσις can have no relation to the remission of sins. Secondly, ἀφιέναι is often taken for *permittere*; as Gen. xx. 6. Οὐκ ἀφῆκά σε ἅψασθαι αὐτῆς· Matt. iii. 15. Ἄφες ἄρτι, and, Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν, which the Vulgar first translated well, *Sine modo*, and then ill, *Tunc dimisit eum*. Matt. vii. 4. Ἄφες ἐκβάλω, *sine ejiciam*; so Hesychius; Ἄφεσις, συγχώρησις. And this hath as little relation to the present subject. Thirdly, ἀφιέναι is sometimes *relinquere* and *deserere*, as Gen. xlii. 33. Ἀδελφὸν ἕνα ἄφετε ὧδε μετ' ἐμοῦ. Matt. v. 24. Ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου. viii. 15. Καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός. xix. 27. Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα. xxvi. 56. Τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον. And in this acceptation it cannot explicate unto us what is the true notion of Ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας. Fourthly, it is taken for *omittere*, as Matt. xxiii. 23. Καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, and Luke xi. 42. Ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι, and yet we have nothing to our present purpose. But fifthly, it is often taken for *remittere*, and that particularly in relation to a debt; as Matt. xviii. 27. Τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ· and verse 32. Πᾶσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην ἀφῆκά σοι. Which acception is most remarkable in the year of release: Deut. xv. 1, 2. Δι' ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν ποιήσεις ἄφεσιν. Καὶ οὕτω τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς ἀφέσεως· ἀφήσεις πᾶν χρέος ἴδιον, ὃ ὀφείλει σοι ὁ πλησίον, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσεις· ἐπικέκληται γὰρ ἄφεσις Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ σου. Now this remission or release of debts hath a great affinity with remission of sins; for Christ himself hath conjoined these two together, and called our sins by the name of debts, and promised remission of sins to us by God, upon our remission of debts to man. And therefore he hath taught us thus to pray; Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. Matt. vi. 12. Besides, he hath not only made use of the notion of debt, but any injury done unto a man he calls a sin against man, and exhorteth to forgive those sins committed against us, that God may forgive the sins committed by us, which are injuries done to him. Luke xvii. 3. Ἐὰν δὲ ἁμάρτῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῷ.

to signify the same action of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular notion, but several times hath another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins[17]; therefore I conceive the true nature of *forgiveness of sins* is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such ways and means which were used by God in the working and performing of it, than in this or any other word which is made use of in expressing it.

Now that we may understand what was done toward the remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what is done in it; it is first to be observed, that *almost all things by the Law* were *purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission.* And what was then legally done, was but a type of that which was to be performed by Christ, and therefore the blood of Christ must necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he *once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*[18]. It must then be acknowledged, and can be denied by none, that Christ did suffer a painful and a shameful death, as we have formerly described it; that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin; for

Heb. ix. 22. Χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐγίνεται ἄφεσις.

Heb. ix. 26.

17 We must not only look upon the propriety of the words used in the New Testament, but we must also reflect upon their use in the Old, especially in such subjects as did belong unto the Old Testament as well as the New. Now Ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας is there used for the verb כפר, as Isa. xxii. 14. אם־יכפר העון הזה לכם עד־תמתון, Οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἕως ἂν ἀποθάνητε· sometimes for the verb נשא, as Gen. l. 17. שא נא פשע אחיך וחטאתם Ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀδικίαν καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν. Psal. xxv. 18. ושא לכל־חטאותי Καὶ ἄφες πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας μου. And in that remarkable place, which St. Paul made use of to declare the nature of remission of sins, Psal. xxxii. 1. אשרי נשוי־פשע Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι. Sometimes it is taken for סלח, as Numb. xiv. 19. סלח־נא לעון העם הזה Ἄφες τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. Lev. iv. 20. ונסלח להם Καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία. Now being ἀφιέναι, in relation to sins, is used for כפר signifying *expiation* and *reconciliation;* for נשא signifying *elevation, portation,* or *ablation;* for סלח signifying *pardon* and *indulgence;* we cannot argue from the word alone, that God in forgiving sins doth only and barely release the debt. There is therefore no force to be laid upon the words Ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, *Remissio peccatorum,* or, as the ancient Fathers, *Remissa peccatorum.* So Tertullian; 'Diximus de remissa peccatorum.' *Adv. Marcion. lib.* iv. *cap.* 18. [p. 432 A.] St. Cyprian; 'Qui blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum non habebit remissam, sed reus est æterni peccati.' *Lib.* iii. *Epist.* 14. [ep. 9. p. 18.] 'Dominus baptizatur a servo, et remissam peccatorum daturus, ipse non dedignatur lavacro regenerationis corpus abluere.' *Idem, de Bono Patient.* [p. 249.] *Idem, lib.* iii. *Epist.* 8, of an infant, 'Qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.' [p. 99.] Add the interpreter of Irenæus concerning Christ; 'Remissam peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum.' *Adv. Hæres. lib.* iv. *cap.* 45. [c. 27. §. 2. p. 264.]

18 It is not only Ἄφεσις, but Ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας.

Heb. x. 12. *this man,* saith the Apostle, *offered one sacrifice for sins;* that the 364
1 Pet. iii. 18. sins for which he suffered were not his own, for *Christ hath once*
Heb. vii. 26. *suffered for sins, the just for the unjust;* he was *holy, harmless, undefiled,* and *separate from sinners,* and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered were ours, for
Isa. liii. 5. *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our*
Rom. iv. 25. Gal. i. 4. *iniquities;* He *was delivered for our offences,* he *gave himself for*
1 Cor. xv. 3. *our sins,* he *died for our sins according to the Scriptures;* that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself, to free us from the punishment due unto
Isa. liii. 6. our sins; for God *laid on him the iniquity of us all,* and *made*
2 Cor. v. 21. Isa. liii. 4, 5. *him to be sin for us who knew no sin: he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed;* that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our
Matt. xxvi. 28. sins it cometh to pass that our sins are forgiven, for, *This is my blood,* saith our Saviour, *of the new testament,* (or *covenant,*)
Eph. i. 7. *which is shed for many for the remission of sins. In* Christ *we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.*

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that *the forgiveness of sins* which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise do believe, containeth in it a reconciliation of an offended God, and a satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, we may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because Christ by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured, because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christ's death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. For we
Rom. iii. 24, 25. are *justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through*
1 John ii. 1, 2; iv. 10. *faith in his blood. We have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins.* For *God loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins.* It is evident therefore that Christ did render God propitious unto us by his blood, (that is, his sufferings unto death,) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation,

that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God, who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer; and though it be most true, that he *so loved the world* John iii.16. *that he gave his only-begotten Son;* yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that Son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; For *all are of God, who hath reconciled us* 2 Cor. v. 18. *to himself by Jesus Christ;* and that by virtue of his death, for *when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death* Rom. v. 10. Col. i. 20. *of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself.* In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but nowhere teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the Scripture to reconcile a man to God, is in our
365 vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the princes of the Philistines spake of David, *Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master?* 1 Sam. xxix. *should it not be with the heads of these men*[19]*?* Wherewith shall 4. he reconcile Saul who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable, but by betraying these men unto him? As our Saviour adviseth, *If thou* Matt. v. 23, *bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy bro-* 24. Πρῶτον δι- *ther hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar,* αλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελ- *and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother,* that is, reconcile φῷ σου. thy brother to thyself, whom thou hast injured, render him by thy submission favourable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended with thee. As the Apostle adviseth the wife that *departeth* from her husband, to *remain* 1 Cor. vii. 11.

[19] Ἐν τίνι διαλλαγήσεται οὗτος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ; οὐχὶ ἐν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων; יתרצה *acceptum se reddet, ita se geret ut Saul cum in gratiam recipere velit.*

unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband, that is, to appease and get the favour of her husband. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto God, when God is reconciled, appeased, and become gracious and favourable unto us; and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God, when he hath moved, and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour. Thus *when we were enemies we were reconciled to God*, that is, notwithstanding he was offended with us for our sins, we were restored under his favour *by the death of his Son*.

Rom. v. 10.

Whence appeareth the weakness of the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God; but God is never said to be reconciled unto us[20]. For by that very expression, it is understood, that he which is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures, is restored unto the favour of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled. As when David was to be reconciled unto Saul, it was not that David should lay down his enmity against Saul, but that Saul should become propitious and favourable unto David: and therefore where the language is that David should be reconciled unto Saul, the sense is, that Saul, who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased, and so reconciled unto David.

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners by the death of Christ, who *while we were yet sinners died for us*, because the punishment which Christ, who was our surety, endured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God. *The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many*[21]. Now *a ransom*

Rom. v. 8.

Matt. xx. 28.

20 'Ad hæc vero quod nos Deo reconciliarit quid affers? Primum, nusquam Scripturam asserere, Deum nobis a Christo reconciliatum, verum id tantum quod nos per Christum aut mortem ejus simus reconciliati, vel Deo reconciliati; ut ex omnibus locis quæ de reconciliatione agunt videre est.' *Catech. Racov. cap.* 8. [p. 187.] To this may be added the observation of Socinus; 'Ita communis consuetudo loquendi fert; ut scilicet is reconciliatus fuisse dicatur, per quem stabat, ne amicitia aut denuo existeret, aut conservaretur.' *De Christo Servatore, p.* i. *cap.* 8. [p. 139.] Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of Saul and David, and in the person mentioned in the Gospel, who is commanded to be reconciled unto him whom he had offended, and who had something against him.

21 Δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. What is the true notion of λύτρον will easily appear, because both the origination and use of the word is sufficiently known. The origination is from λύειν, *solvere, to loose*; Λύτρον quasi λυτήριον. *Etymol.* Θρέπτρα τὰ θρεπτήρια, ὥσπερ λύτρα τὰ λυτήρια. Eustathius; Λέγει δὲ Θρέπτρα (*ita leg.*) τὰ τροφεῖα ἐκ τοῦ θρεπτήρια κατὰ συγκοπήν· ὡς λυτήρια λύτρα, σωτήρια σῶ-

is a price given to redeem such as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound becometh free. All sinners were obliged to undergo such punishments as are
366 proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of price[22] given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is enthralled. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price; neither is it more certain that he died, than that he bought us: *Ye are bought with a price*, saith the Apostle, and it is *the Lord who bought* us, and the price which he paid was his blood; for we are *not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ*[23]. Now as it was the blood of Christ, so was it

1 Cor. vi. 20: vii. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 1. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

στρα. *Iliad.* δ'. 478. Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis solvatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ἐξωνήσεως οἰκεῖον τὸ λύεσθαι· ὅθεν καὶ λύτρα τὰ δῶρα λέγονται τὰ εἰς τοῦτο διδόμενα· Eustathius upon that of Homer, *Iliad.* α'. 13. Λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα. It is properly spoken of such things as are given to redeem a captive, or recover a man into a free condition: Hesychius; Πάντα τὰ διδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκτησιν ἀνθρώπων (so I read it, not ἀνάκλησιν.) So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is Λύτρον, and whatsoever is not given for such an end deserveth not that name in Greek. As the city Antandrus was so called, because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive. Ὅτι Ἀσκάνιος αἰχμάλωτος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν καὶ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ τὴν πόλιν δέδωκε λύτρα, καὶ ἀπελύθη. *Etymol.* So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language than the words of our Saviour, Δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν· Δοῦναι λύτρον, for Λύτρον is τὸ διδόμενον, and ἀντὶ πολλῶν, for it is given ἀντὶ ἀνθρώπων, as that city was called Ἀνταν̃δρος· ἤγουν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς δεδομένη. And therefore 1 Tim. ii. 6. it is said, Ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.

22 Hesychius; Λύτρον, τίμημα.

23 This is sufficiently expressed by two words, each of them fully significative of a price: the first simple, which is ἀγοράζειν, the second in composition, which is ἐξαγοράζειν. That the word ἀγοράζειν in the New Testament signifieth properly to *buy*, appeareth generally in the Evangelists, and particularly in that place of the Revelations xiii. 17. Ἵνα μήτις δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι. In the same signification it is attributed undoubtedly unto Christ in respect of us whom he is often said to have bought; as 2 Pet. ii. 1. Τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι· and this buying is expressed to be by a price; 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. Οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν, ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· *Vulg. Non estis vestri, empti enim estis pretio magno:* and 1 Cor. vii. 23. Τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε· μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων. What this price was is also evident, for the Τιμή was the Τίμιον αἷμα, the precious blood of Christ, or the blood given by way of price: Rev. v. 9. Ὅτι ἐσφάγης, καὶ ἠγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου. Which will appear more fully by the compound word ἐξαγοράζω. Gal. iii. 13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα· and Gal. iv. 4, 5. Γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ. Now this Ἐξαγορασμός is proper redemption, or Λύτρωσις, upon a proper price, though

a price given by way of compensation: and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented and increaseth, according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it; so the value, price, and dignity of that which is given by way of compensation, is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite majesty, against whom we have sinned; and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ransom for sinners: for *God* hath *purchased* his *Church with his own blood.* Although therefore God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to remit the price[24] without which we had never been redeemed: neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

Acts xx. 28.

If then we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made, and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whensoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt, which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence; and God, who is the Lawgiver and Sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God for and instead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God than that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man: which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punish-

not silver or gold, yet as proper as silver and gold, and far beyond them both; Οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

24 As Λύτρον is a certain price given or promised for liberty, so Ἀφιέναι λύτρον is to remit the price set upon the head of any man, or promised for him; as we read in the testament of Lycon the philosopher; Δημητρίῳ μὲν ἐλευθέρῳ πάλαι ὄντι ἀφίημι τὰ λύτρα. Demetrius had been his servant, and he had set him free upon a certain price which he had engaged himself to pay for that liberty; the sum which Demetrius was thus bound to pay, Lycon at his death remits, as also to Criton; Κρίτωνι δὲ Χαλκηδονίῳ, καὶ τούτῳ τὰ λύτρα ἀφίημι. *Diog. Laert. lib.* v. *Segm.* 72.

ment which Christ endured, taketh off our obligation to eternal punishment.

Thus man who violated, by sinning, the law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergo the punishment due unto the sin, and to be inflicted by the
367 wrath of God, is, by the price of the most precious blood of Christ, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favour of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithful and just to take off all obligation unto punishment from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth *the forgiveness of sins;* which is sufficient for the first part of the explication of this Article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of *remission of sins,* in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the explication, taking notice not only of the substance, but also of the order of the Article, observing the immediate connection of it with the *Holy Church,* and the relation, which in the opinion of the ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great privilege of *forgiveness of sins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the Church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the Apostles to gather a Church unto him, he foretold *that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem;* and when the Church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out;* and, *Be it known unto you, that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins.* From whence it appeareth that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the Church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins, that the doctrine of remission of all sins propounded and preached to all men, was proper and peculiar to the Gospel, which teacheth us that *by* Christ *all that believe are justified from all things, from which* they *could not be justified by the law of Moses.* Therefore John the Baptist, who went *before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways,* gave *knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins.*

Luke xxiv. 47.

Acts iii. 19. xiii. 38.

Acts xiii. 39.

Luke i. 76, 77.

This, as it was preached by the Apostles at the first gathering of the Church of Christ, I call proper and peculiar to the Gospel,

because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the Law. For if we consider the Law itself strictly and under the bare notion of a law, it promised life only upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was only this, *Do this and live.* Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the Law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversible; nor was there any other way or means left in the law of Moses, by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other less and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them; and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the Law, was of some special divine indulgence, more than was promised by Moses, though not more than was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the Gospel was mingled with the Law.

Now as to the atonement made by the sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the Messias; and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was
Rev. xiii. 8. *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,* so all atonements which were ever made, were only effectual by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven, but by virtue of that satisfaction; though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation; yet the general doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed, and publicly preached to all nations, till the coming of the Saviour of the world[25], whose name was therefore called *Jesus,* because he was
Matt. i. 21. to *save his people from their sins.*

Being therefore we are assured that the preaching remission of sins belongeth not only certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, 368
to the Church of Christ, it will be next considerable how this remission is conferred upon any person in the Church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable; one relating to the initiation, the other concerning the continuation, of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most general and irrefragable assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is

25 'Lex peccatorum nescit remissionem; lex mysterium non habet quo occulta mundantur: et ideo quod in lege minus est, consummatur in Evangelio.' *S. Ambros. in Lucam, lib.* vi. *cap.* 7. [§. 23. vol. i. p. 1389 C.]

guilty of, are remitted in the baptism of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptism are remissible; and the person committing those sins shall receive forgiveness upon true repentance, at any time, according to the Gospel.

First, It is certain, that *forgiveness of sins* was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefit of that ordinance, which is *remission of sins*. *John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.* Mark i. 4. And St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.* Acts ii. 38. In vain doth doubting and fluctuating Socinus endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture[26]: attributing the remission either to repentance without consideration of baptism; or else to the public profession of faith made in baptism; or if any thing must be attributed to baptism itself, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these shifts agree with that which Ananias said unto Saul, without any mention either of repentance or confession, *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins?* Acts xxii. 16. and that which St. Paul, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the Church, that Christ doth *sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water?* Eph. v. 26. It is therefore sufficiently certain that baptism, as it was instituted by Christ after the preadministration of St. John, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this sacrament.

As those which are received into the Church by the sacrament of baptism receive the remission of their sins of which they were guilty before they were baptized; so after they are thus made

[26] 'Vel baptismo illi, hoc est, solenniter peractæ ablutioni, peccatorum remissionem nequaquam tribuit Petrus, sed totam pœnitentiæ;—vel si baptismi quoque ea in re rationem habuit, aut quatenus publicam Jesu Christi nominis professionem continet, eum tantummodo consideravit; aut si ipsius etiam externæ ablutionis omnino rationem habere voluit, quod ad ipsam attinet, remissionis peccatorum nomine, non ipsam remissionem vere, sed remissionis declarationem, et obsignationem quandam intellexit.' *Socin. de Baptismo, cap.* 7. [vol. i. p. 724.]

members of the Church, they receive remission of their future sins by their repentance[27]. Christ who hath left us a pattern of prayer, hath thereby taught us for ever to implore and beg the forgiveness of our sins; that as we through the frailty of our nature are always subject unto sin, so we should always exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favour 369
of God. This then is the comfort of the Gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagems of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are always subject to offend
1 John i. 8. (from whence whosoever saith *that he hath no sin is a liar*, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency); and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply ourselves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his grace, and pardoned by his mercy.

And therefore the Church of God, in which *remission of sin* is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian[28].

27 St. Chrysostom speaking of the power of the Priests, Οὐ γὰρ ὅτ' ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννῶσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἁμαρτήματα. *De Sacerd. lib.* iii. [§. 6. vol. i. p. 384 E.] 'Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attractum est, regeneratione detrahatur; et tamen activa quoque peccata, quæcunque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit, tollit;) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reatus et ingeneratus et additus; ipsa etiam vita cætera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpolleat fœcunditate justitiæ, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur: quoniam filii Dei, quamdiu mortaliter vivunt, cum morte confligunt: et quamvis de illis sit veraciter dictum, *Quotquot Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei:* sic tamen Spiritu Dei excitantur, et tanquam filii Dei proficiunt ad Deum, ut etiam Spiritu suo, maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore, tanquam filii hominum quibusdam humanis motibus deficiant ad seipsos, et ideo peccent.' *S. August. Enchir. cap.* 64. [§. 17. vol. vi. p. 220 B.] Οὕτω καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐκκαθαίρεται ἁμαρτήματα μετὰ πόνου πολλοῦ καὶ καμάτου. Πᾶσαν τοίνυν ἐπιδειξώμεθα σπουδὴν, ὥστε αὐτὰ ἐξαλεῖψαι ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ αἰσχύνης, καὶ τῆς κολάσεως ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ἐκεῖ· κἂν γὰρ μυρία ὦμεν ἡμαρτηκότες, ἂν ἐθέλωμεν, δυνησόμεθα ἅπαντα ταῦτα ἀποθέσθαι τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰ φορτία. *S. Chrysost. Homil. in Pentecost.* 1. [§. 6. vol. ii. p. 467 E.] 'Quod autem scriptum est, *Et sanguis Jesu filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato,* tam in confessione baptismatis, quam in clementia pœnitudinis accipiendum est.' *S. Hieron. adv. Pelag. lib.* ii. [§. 7. vol. ii. p. 736 C.]

28 I call this the heresy of Novatian rather than of Novatus, because though they both joined in it, yet it rather sprung from Novatianus the Roman presbyter, than from Novatus the Afri-

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth, first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this persuasion. For we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, nay, God himself hath concluded all under sin; we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternal punishment from the wrath of God, provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the devils, *delivered into chains* and *reserved unto judgment*. For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference; remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not. 2 Pet. ii. 4.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity die, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to shew a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and almighty God. Glorious therefore must the goodness of our God appear, who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looseth the obligation, who imputeth not the sin. This is God's goodness, this is man's happiness. For *blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity*. The year of release, the year of jubilee, was a time of public joy; and there is no voice like that, *Thy sins are forgiven thee*. By this a Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.

can bishop. And he is thus expressed by Epiphanius, Λέγων μὴ εἶναι σωτηρίαν, ἀλλὰ μίαν μετάνοιαν· μετὰ δὲ τὸ λουτρὸν, μηκέτι δύνασθαι ἐλεεῖσθαι παραπεπτωκότα· that is, he acknowledged but one repentance which was available, in baptism; after which if any man sinned, there was no mercy remaining for him. To which Epiphanius gives this reply; Ἡ μὲν τελεία μετάνοια ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ τυγχάνει· εἰ δέ τις παρέπεσεν οὐκ ἀπόλλει τοῦτον ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία· δίδωσι γὰρ ἐπάνοδον, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν τὴν μεταμέλειαν. And again; Δέχεται οὖν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος, καὶ ἡ ἁγία Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία πάντοτε τὴν μετάνοιαν. *Hæres.* lix. §. 1, 2. [vol. i. p. 493 C, D, 494 D.] And yet more generally; Τὰ πάντα σαφῶς τετελείωται μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδημίαν, ἔτι δὲ ὄντων ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι πάντων, καὶ μετὰ πτῶσιν ἔτι ἀνάστασις, ἔτι ἐλπὶς, ἔτι θεραπεία, ἔτι ὁμολογία· κἂν εἰ μὴ τελειότατα, ἀλλ' οὖν γε τῶν ἄλλων οὐκ ἀπηγόρευται ἡ σωτηρία. [Ibid. §. 10. p. 502 C.]

man is rescued from infernal pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternal happiness.

Thirdly, It is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be inflamed with the love of God: for that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the parable in the Gospel, *There was a certain creditor which had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.* Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *Which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Luke vii. 41, 42.

370

Fourthly, The true notion of *forgiveness of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgiveness. *Through this man is preached unto* us *the forgiveness of sins*, and without a surety we had no release. He rendered God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. We *are not our own* who are *bought with a price:* we must *glorify God in our bodies, and in our spirits, which are God's.* We must be no longer *the servants of men;* we are the *servants of Christ*, who *are bought with a price.*

Acts xiii. 38.

1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

1 Cor. vii. 22, 23.

Fifthly, It is necessary to believe *remission of sins* as wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the covenant was ratified and confirmed, which mindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a covenant to expect performances on both parts; and therefore if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together, and those which God hath joined ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear *a Prince and a Saviour*, and it was *to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins:* he joined these two in the Apostles' commission, saying, that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.*

Acts v. 31.

Luke xxiv. 47.

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to

believe and confess in this Article of *forgiveness of sins;* for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I do freely and fully acknowledge and with unspeakable comfort embrace this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, and upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin, they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternal death; it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself, to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ransom, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God; by which propitiation, God, who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the Church of Christ the sacrament of baptism for the first remission, and repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses. And thus *I believe the forgiveness of sins.*

371

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

THIS Article was anciently delivered and acknowledged by all Churches, only with this difference, that whereas in other places it was expressed in general terms, *the resurrection of the flesh,* they of the Church of Aquileia, by the addition of a pronoun, propounded it to every single believer in a more particular way of expression, *the resurrection of this flesh*[29]. And though

29 'Cum omnes Ecclesiæ ita sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerint *peccatorum remissionem,* addant *carnis resurrectionem;* sancta Aquileiensis Ecclesia——ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; et pro eo quod cæteri dicunt, *carnis resurrectionem,* nos dicimus, *hujus carnis resurrectionem.' Ruffin. Invect. in Hieron. lib.* i. [§. 4. apud Hieron. vol. ii. p. 586 E.] 'Satis cauta et provida adjectione fidem Symboli Ecclesia nostra docet, quæ in eo quod a cæteris traditur, *carnis resurrectionem,* uno addito pronomine tradit, *hujus carnis resurrectionem.' Idem, in Symb.* [§. 43. p. ccxxix.] 'Sive ergo corpus resurrecturum dicimus, secundum Apostolum dicimus (hoc enim nomine usus est ille;) sive carnem dicimus, secundum traditionem Symboli confitemur.' *Idem, Prol. in Apolog. Pamphili.* [In the Appendix to vol. iv. of Origen, p. 17.]

we have translated it in our English Creed, *the resurrection of the body;* yet neither the Greek nor Latin ever delivered this Article in those terms, but in these, *the resurrection of the flesh;* because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestial and spiritual bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other[30]. Only it will be necessary, for shewing our agreement with the ancient Creeds, to declare that as by *flesh* they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh; so we, when we translate it *body*, understand no other *body* but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the soul. And this we may very well and properly do, because our Church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare ourselves. For though in the Creed itself, used at Morning and Evening Prayer, the Article be thus delivered, *the resurrection of the body*, yet in the form of public baptism, where it is propounded by way of question to the godfathers, in the name of the child to be baptized, it runneth thus, *Dost thou believe—the resurrection of the flesh?* We see by daily experience that all men are mortal; that the body, left by the soul, the salt and life thereof, putrifieth and consumeth, and, according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust: but these bodies, as frail and mortal as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this Article, in which we profess to believe *the resurrection of the body.*

Page 455. When we treated concerning the resurrection of Christ, we delivered the proper notion and nature of the resurrection in general, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then

[30] The Greeks always, Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, the Latins, *Carnis Resurrectionem.* And this was to be observed, because, being we read of spiritual bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this St. Jerom gives an account, and withal of the words of the Creed: 'Exempli causa pauca subjiciam. *Credimus*, inquiunt, *resurrectionem futuram corporum.* Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt cœlestia et terrestria, et aer iste et aura tenuis juxta naturam suam corpora nominantur, *corpus* ponunt, non *carnem*, ut orthodoxus corpus audiens, carnem putet; hæreticus spiritum recognoscat. Hæc est eorum prima decipula; quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instruunt alios dolos, et innocentiam simulant, et malitiosos nos vocant, et quasi simpliciter credentes, aiunt, *Credimus resurrectionem carnis.* Hoc vero cum dixerint, vulgus indoctum putat sibi sufficere, maxime quia idipsum et in Symbolo creditur.' *Epist.* 65. *ad Pam. et Ocean.* [Epist. LXXIV. 5. p. 522 D.]

delivered, or make any addition as to that particular; but, referring the reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us only to consider what is the resurrection to come, who are they which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of Christ's resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corrup-
372 tion; all the parts thereof continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them; they were only deposited in a sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortal bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality: we may *say to corruption, Thou art my father; to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister;* our corps go *down to the bars of the pit,* and *rest together in the dust.* Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of soul and body, as Christ's was, but our whole tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled, and confounded with the dust of the earth. There is a description of a kind of resurrection in the prophet Ezekiel, in which there is supposed a *valley full of bones,* and *there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet.* But in the resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.

Job xvii. 14, 16.

Ez. xxxvii. 1, 7, 8, 10.

We must therefore undertake to shew that the bodies of men, howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be recollected in themselves and united to their own souls. And for the more facile and familiar proceeding in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method; first, to prove that such a resurrection is not in itself impossible: secondly, to shew that it is upon general considerations highly probable: thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in itself impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon natural and moral grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon evangelical principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

First, I confess philosophers[31] of old did look upon the resurrection of the body as impossible, and though some of them thought the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoined to the spirit of a man. We read of *certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks*, who *encountered* St. Paul; *and when they heard of the resurrection*, they *mocked him*, some saying, *that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection.* But as the ancient philosophers thought a creation impossible, because they looked only upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a creation not only possible, but performed; so did they think a resurrection of corrupted, dissolved, and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature, which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tied to the consideration of nature only, but estimating things possible and impossible by the power of God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

Acts xvii. 18, 32.

For, if the resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be 373
so in one of these respects; either in reference to the Agent, or in relation to the patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty, that there neither is nor can be any agent of wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves, and altered from their former nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the resur-

31 Pliny reckoning up those things which he thought not to be in the power of God, mentions these two; 'Mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos.' *Nat. Hist. lib.* ii. *cap.* 7. [cap. 5.] And Æschylus, though a Pythagorean, yet absolutely denies it to be in the power of God; for so he makes Apollo speak to the Eumenides:

Πέδας μὲν ἂν λύσειεν, ἔστι τοῦδ' ἄκος,
Καὶ κάρτα πολλὴ μηχανὴ λυτήριος.
Ἀνδρὸς δ' ἐπειδὰν οἶμ' ἀνασπάσῃ κόνις
Ἅπαξ θανόντος, οὔτις ἐστ' ἀνάστασις.
Τούτων ἐπῳδὰς οὐκ ἐποίησεν πατὴρ
Οὐμὸς, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω
Στρέφων τίθησιν, οὐδὲν ἀσθμαίνων μένει.
Eumen. v. 648.

'Ut anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur: et ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur.' *Tertull. de Præscr. Hæret. cap.* 7. [p. 204 C.]

rection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

Now if the resurrection were impossible in respect of the agent which should effect it, the impossibility must arise either from an insufficiency of knowledge or of power[32]; for if either the agent know not what is to be done, or if he know it, but hath no power to do it, either he will not attempt it, or if he do, must fail in the attempt; but that, of which he hath perfect knowledge, and full power to effect, cannot be impossible in relation to the agent endued with such knowledge, armed with such power.

Now when we say the resurrection is possible, we say not it is so to men or angels, or any creature of a limited knowledge or finite power, but we attribute it to God, *with whom nothing is impossible;* his understanding is infinite, he knoweth all the men which ever lived since the foundation, or shall live unto the dissolution of the world, *he knoweth whereof all things are made,* from what *dust* we came, into what *dust we shall return.* Our *substance was not hid from thee,* O Lord, *when* we *were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see* our *substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all* our *members written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them.* Thus every particle of our bodies, every dust and atom which belongeth to us, is known to him that made us. The generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the *Father of Spirits,* the augmentation of the same is known to him *in* whom *we live, move, and have our being;* the dissolution of our tabernacles is perceived by that God by whom the *very hairs of* our *head are all numbered,* and *without* whom *one sparrow shall not fall to the ground.* He which numbereth the sands of the sea, knoweth all the scattered bones, seeth into all the graves and tombs, searcheth all the repositories and dormitories in the earth, knoweth what dust belongeth to each body, what body to

Luke i. 37.

Ps. cxxxix. 15, 16.

Heb. xii. 9.

Acts xvii. 28.

Matt. x. 29, 30.

32 Τὸ ἀδύνατόν τινι γιγνώσκεται κατ' ἀλήθειαν τοιοῦτον, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γιγνώσκειν τὸ γενησόμενον, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ δύναμιν ἀρκοῦσαν μὴ ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι καλῶς τὸ ἐγνωσμένον. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγνοῶν τι τῶν γενέσθαι δεόντων, οὐκ ἂν οὔτ' ἐγχειρῆσαι, οὔτε ποιῆσαι τὸ παράπαν δυνηθείη ὅπερ ἀγνοεῖ· ὅ τε γινώσκων καλῶς τὸ ποιηθησόμενον, καὶ πόθεν γένοιτ' ἂν, καὶ πῶς, δύναμιν δὲ ἢ μηδ' ὅλως ἔχων πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ γινωσκόμενον ἢ μὴ ἀρκοῦσαν ἔχων, οὐκ ἂν ἐγχειρήσειε τὴν ἀρχὴν, εἰ σωφρονοίη καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐπισκέψηται δύναμιν· ἐγχειρήσας δὲ ἀπερισκέπτως, οὐκ ἂν ἐπιτελέσειε τὸ δόξαν. *Athenag. de Resur. Mort.* [c. 2. p. 316.]

each soul. Again, as his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be united, by which this ruined fabrick should be recomposed; he knoweth how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour-bone, how every sinew may be reembroidered on it; he understandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoined, what is the proper *gluten* by which they may become united. The resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

And as the wisdom is infinite, so the power of this Agent is illimited; for God is as much omnipotent as omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; 37
nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance: all creatures must not only suffer, but do what he will have them; they are not only passively, but actively obediential. There is no atom of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applied and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the Agent, or him who is to raise us.

Secondly, The resurrection is not impossible in relation to the patient, because where we look upon the power of God, nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is so far from a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rational and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we lose in death, is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the chambers of nature[33], and it is no more a contradiction that

33 'Non sola anima seponitur: habet et caro secessus suos interim, in aquis, in ignibus, in alitibus, in bestiis: quum in hæc dissolvi videtur, velut in vasa transfunditur.' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 63. [p. 364 C.] 'Tu perire et Deo credis, si quid oculis nostris hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne, sive arescit

they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are within the knowledge and power of God[34], and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made, was as far from being flesh, as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an omnipotent power which could mould that into an human body, and breathe into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, human bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easy to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not[35]. When there was no man, God made

in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis; sed Deo elementorum custodi reservatur.' *Minut. Fel. in Octav. cap.* 34. 'Omnia quæ discerpuntur, et in favillas quasdam putrescunt, integra Deo sunt; in illa enim elementa mundi eunt, unde primo venerunt.' *S. August. Enarr. in Psal.* lxii. [§. 6. vol. iv. p. 610 A.]

34 'Absit autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit omnipotentia Creatoris omnia revocare, quæ vel bestiæ, vel ignis absumpsit, vel in pulverem cineremve collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhalatum. Absit ut sinus ullus, secretumque naturæ ita recipiat aliquid subtractum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut lateat cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xxii. *cap.* 20. [vol. vii. p. 682 G.]

35 'Recogita quid fueris antequam esses; utique nihil. Meminisses enim, si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras, priusquam esses, idem nihil factus cum esse desieris, cur non possis rursus esse de nihilo, ejusdem ipsius Auctoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? Qui non eras, factus es; cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, et tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies, quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es, quod nunquam fuisti aliquando.' *Tertull. Apolog. c.* 48. [p. 38 A.] 'Utique idoneus est reficere, qui fecit; quanto plus est fecisse, quam refecisse; initium dedisse, quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione.' *Idem, de Resur. Carn. cap.* 11. [p. 332 A.] 'Difficilius est id, quod non sit, incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare.' *Minut. Fel. in Octav. cap.* 43. 'Utique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuerit. Quomodo ergo impossibile esse dicis, ut Deus, qui hominem formavit, ex nihilo reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulverem, qui si etiam in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus; sicut et fecit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuissemus?' *S. August. de verb. Apost. Serm.* 34.* To the same purpose the Jews; דלא הוו הוו דהוו לא כל שכן.†

* [This is not a work of Augustin. v. Op. vol. v. Append. Serm. cix. p. 199 B.]

† [This passage makes no sense as it stands, but probably Bp. Pearson was referring to the argument upon the Resurrection in the Talmud, Tract. Sanhed. Perek Chelek, f. 91a, where an unbeliever makes the objection that the dead can

him of the earth; and therefore, when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again. The resurrection therefore cannot be impossible, which is our first conclusion.

Secondly, The resurrection is not only in itself possible, so 375
that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many general considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immaterial, so they are immortal; and being once created by the Father of spirits, they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the fowls of the air, several of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, divers of the plants of the earth, are of a more durable constitution, and outlive the sons of men. And can we think that such material and mortal, that such inunderstanding souls should by God and nature be furnished with bodies of so long permansion, and that our spirits should be joined unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence? but when the soul of man, which is immortal, is forced from its body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the only life belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

Again, if we look upon ourselves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordinable unto reward or punishment. The angels who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being only spirits they were subject to no other dissolution than annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station

never live again: to which it is answered, אף כל שכן לא היו חיי דהוה חיי if those who have never existed become alive, much more shall the man who has been alive, live again.—R.P.S.]

were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity: and thus all the angels are incapable of a resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedom cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded; and therefore when they die, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us are neither capable of reward or punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they die, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason for their resurrection. But man by the nobleness of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that, being capable in another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a punishment for what he hath done ill in the flesh, it is necessary that he should rise from the dead to enjoy the one, or suffer the other. For there is not only no just retribution rendered in this life to man, but, considering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is possible, and often cometh to pass, that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments in this life can no way equalize them[36]. It is just, that he who sheddeth man's blood, by man his blood should be shed; but what death can sufficiently retaliate the many murders committed by one notorious pirate, who may cast many thousands overboard; or the rapines and assassinations of one rebel or tyrant, who may destroy whole nations? It is fit that he which blasphemeth God should die; but what equivalent punishment can he receive in this life, who shall constantly blaspheme the name of God, destroy his priests and temples, abolish his worship, and extirpate his servants? What is then more proper, con-
376 sidering the providence of a most just God, than to believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that

[36] Παρίημι γὰρ λέγειν ὅτι σωζομένης τῆς φύσεως, ἐν ᾗ νῦν ἐσμὲν, οὔθ' ἡ θνητὴ φύσις ἐνεγκεῖν οἷά τε τὴν σύμμετρον δίκην πλειόνων ἢ βαρυτέρων φερομένων πλημμελημάτων. *Athenag. de Resur. Mort.* [c. 19. p. 332 B.]

alone, but have most frequent reflection on the body, without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer any thing[37]. It is therefore highly probable, from the general consideration of human actions and divine retributions, that there
2 Cor. v. 10. shall be a resurrection of the flesh, *that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

Furthermore, beside the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things without us, and the natural course of variations in the creature, will render the resurrection yet more highly probable. Every space of twenty-four hours teacheth thus much, in which there is always a revolution amounting to a resurrection. The day dies into a night, and is buried in silence and in darkness; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkness, rising from the dead of night: this is a diurnal resurrection[38]. As the day dies into night, so doth the summer into winter; the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the earth is covered with snow, or crusted with frost, and becomes a general

37 'Quod congruet judicari, hoc competet etiam resuscitari.' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 14. [p. 333 C.] 'Negent operarum societatem, ut merito possint etiam mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro, si non fuerit et in causa. Sola anima revocetur, si sola decedit. At enim non magis sola decedit, quam sola decucurrit illud unde decedit: vitam hanc dico.' *Ibid. cap.* 15. 'Cum omnis vitæ nostræ usus in corporis animæque consortio sit, resurrectio autem aut boni actus præmium habeat aut pœnam improbi, necesse est corpus resurgere cujus actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in judicium vocabitur sine corpore, cum de suo et corporis contubernio ratio præstanda sit?' *S. Ambros. de Fide Resur.* [§. 52. vol. ii. p. 1147 C.]

38 Κατανόησον τὴν τῶν καιρῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν τελευτὴν, πῶς καὶ αὐτὰ τελευτᾷ καὶ ἀνίσταται. *S. Theoph. Antioch. ad Autol. lib.* i. [c. 13. p. 345 D.] 'Dies moritur in noctem, et tenebris usquequaque sepelitur. Funestatur mundi honor; omnis substantia denigratur. Sordent, silent, stupent cuncta; ubique justitium est, [quies rerum]. Ita lux amissa lugetur: et tamen rursus cum suo cultu, cum dote, cum sole, eadem et integra et tota universo orbi reviviscit; interficiens mortem suam, noctem; rescindens sepulturam suam, tenebras; hæres sibimet existens, donec et nox reviviscat, cum suo et illa suggestu. Redaccenduntur enim et stellarum radii, quos matutina succensio extinxerat. Reducuntur et siderum absentiæ, quas temporalis distinctio exemerat. Redornantur et specula lunæ, quæ menstruus numerus adtriverat.' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 12. [p. 332 A.] 'Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet, et tenebræ pari vice decedendo succedunt: sidera defuncta reviviscunt; tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt; fructus consumuntur et redeunt.' *Idem, Apolog. cap.* 48. [p. 38 B.] Δύνει ἡ ἡμέρα, καὶ νεκρῶν αἰνιττόμεθα τὸν τρόπον, κοιμισμὸν αἰνιττομένης· ἀνατέλλει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμᾶς διϋπνίζουσα, καὶ ἀναστάσεως ὑποδεικνύουσα τὸ σημεῖον. *Epiph. in Ancorato*, §. 84. [vol. ii. p. 88 D.]

sepulchre: when the spring appeareth, all begin to rise; the plants and flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow, and flourish: this is the annual resurrection. The corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by a succession of resurrections. Thus all things are repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing, and revive by dying; and can we think that man, the lord of all these things, which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again[39]? Is it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of human nature, of
377 the liberty and remunerability of human actions, and of the natural revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

We must not rest in this school of nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelihoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility unto a high presumption and probability, so must we pass from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the revelation

[39] 'Omnia pereundo servantur, omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te, vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium et resurgentium, ad hoc morieris ut pereas?' *Tertull. Apolog. cap.* 48. [p. 38 B.] 'Revolvuntur hyemes et æstates, verna et autumna, cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe etiam terræ de cœlo disciplina est arbores vestire post spolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ absumpta sunt semina; nec prius exhibere, quam absumpta. Mira ratio; de fraudatrice servatrix; ut reddat, intercipit; ut custodiat, perdit; ut integret, vitiat; ut etiam ampliet, prius decoquit. Siquidem uberiora et cultiora restituit, quam exterminavit: revera fœnore interitu, et injuria usura, et lucro damno. Semel dixerim, universa conditio recidiva est. Quodcunque conveneris, fuit, quodcunque amiseris, nihil non iterum est. Omnia in statum redeunt, quum abscesserint; omnia incipiunt, cum desierint: ideo finiuntur, ut fiant: nihil deperit, nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolubilis rerum, testatio est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam præscripsit Deus antequam literis; viribus prædicavit antequam vocibus. Præmisit tibi naturam magistram, submissurus et prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ, discipulus naturæ; quo statim admittas, cum audieris quod ubique jam videris; nec dubites Deum carnis etiam resuscitatorem, quem omnium noris restitutorem. Et utique si omnia homini resurgunt, cui procurata sunt; porro non homini, nisi et carni, quale est ut ipsa depereat in totum, propter quam et cui nihil deperit?' *Idem, de Resur. Carn. cap.* 12. [p. 332 B.]

of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance, I shall shew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not only delivered that intention in his word, but hath also several ways confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a revelation of this truth. The Jews insist upon such weak inferences out of the Law, as shew that the resurrection was not clearly delivered by Moses[40]; and in the book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed, they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of Job are very express, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* Against the evidence of this truth there are two interpretations; one very new of some late opinionists, who understand this of a sudden restitution to his former temporal condition; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happiness of another life, without any reference to a resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any sudden restitution, or any alteration of his temporal condition, is apparent out of the remarkable pre-

Job xix. 25, 26.

40 They produce several places out of Moses, which when the resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it; but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a mystery. As because in the formation of man Moses useth the word וייצר with two *jods*, and in the formation of beasts ויצר with but one: therefore the beasts are made but once, but man twice; once in his generation, and again in his resurrection. They strangely apprehend a promise of the resurrection, even in the malediction, *Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return;* תלך לא נאמר אלא תשוב it is not *thou shalt go* to the dust, but, *thou shalt return.* As if he had said, Thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again as now thou doest. So from those words, Exod. xv. 1. אז ישיר־משה they conclude the resurrection upon this ground; שר לא נאמר אלא ישיר It is not said, *he sang*, but *he shall sing*, viz. after the resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like arguments did the Rabbins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadducees; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job.

face ushering in this expression, *O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!* He desires that his words may continue as long as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope, so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he pleadeth a Redeemer, and for his resurrection he sheweth expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer[41]. It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporal restitution: the first words, *I also know,* denote a certainty and a community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it, and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity; *I know* certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know, that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this *I also know*. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the *Redeemer,* sheweth that he
378 understands it of Christ; the time expressed denotes the futurition at *the latter day;* the description of that Redeemer, *standing on the earth,* representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead; and seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the promised Messias; from whence this future happy condition, which they allow, would clearly involve a resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledged the words of Daniel to declare as much, *and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion*[42].

Job xix. 23, 24.

ואני ידעתי:

גאלי:

אחרון:

Dan. xii. 2.

41 This place is urged by St. Clemens Romanus, the immediate successor of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, where instead of these words of the LXX, Ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα, he reads, Καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην, τὴν ἀνατλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα. §. 26. [p. 164.]

42 The Jews collect from hence the resurrection; as Rabina in *Sanhedrin,* and in the *Midrash Tillim.* Psal. xciii. 3. אר״ רחמון ישני עפר הם המתים שנ׳ ורבים מישני אדמת־עפר יקיצו וגו׳ *Rabbi Rachmon said, that the sleepers in the dust are the dead, as it is written,* Dan. xii. 2. *Many of them that sleep in*

If these and other places of the Old Testament shew that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead, we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. Christ, who called
John xi. 25. himself *the resurrection and the life*, refuted the Sadducees, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the law of Moses, and made it an argu-
Matt. xxii. 31, 32. ment to prove as much, [*As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*] With the force of which argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadducees silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not received the promises which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life, in which they may receive it. So that the argument of our Saviour is the same
Exod. vi. 3, 4. which the Jews have drawn from another place of Moses, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein*

the dust of the earth shall awake, &c.* And this is only denied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it only and wholly to the times of Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by St. Jerom: 'Tunc hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, et operti erant malorum pondere, et quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere surrexerunt; et de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes legis resurgentes in vitam æternam, et prævaricatores in opprobrium sempiternum.' *Ad locum.* [vol. v. p. 725 D.] Where it is to be observed, that he gives a probable gloss of the former part of the verse, but none at all of the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former: for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternal life, nor to an everlasting contempt. Thus, I say, only the Gentiles did interpret it, but now the Socinians are joined to them. So Volkelius urges, 'quod in præcedentibus de Antiochi tempore agatur, et resurrectio illa ad tempora quæ jam præcesserunt spectet.' *De Vera Relig. lib.* iii. [c. xi.]

* [Quoted from Martini Pug. Fid. p. 583; but though the rest of Martin's quotation is to be found in the Midrash Tillim, this gloss of R. Rachmon is neither extant there nor in the Jalkut.—R.P.S.]

they were strangers[43]. It is not said, *to give their sons*, but, *to give them the land of Canaan;* and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must live again, that they may receive the promise.

And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadducees out of the law of Moses, so did St. Paul join himself unto the Pharisees in this particular; for being called before the council, and *perceiving that the one part were Sadducees and the other* Acts xxiii. *Pharisees*, one denying, the other asserting the resurrection, *he* 6. *cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I* 379 *am called in question;* and answering before Felix that they had *found* no *evil doing in* him, *while* he *stood before the council* Acts xxiv. he mentioned this particularly, *except it be for this one voice, that* 20, 21. *I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day.*

It is evident therefore that the resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses's chair did collect it from thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world; that the Sadducees who denied it *erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God;* that Matt. xxii. our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it 29. out of the law of Moses, refuted the Sadducees, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the Apostles, who followed him, confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the raising of the dead was made known unto the sons of men; and because God can do whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a resurrection by virtue of a clear revelation.

Beside, God hath not only foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God

[43] Exod. vi. 4. לתת לכם לא נאמר אלא להם מכאן לתחיית המתים מן התורה *It is not said* to give you, *but* to give them, *whereby the resurrection of the dead appeareth out of the Law. R. Simai, in Perek Chelek.* [of Tract. Sanhedrin of the Talmud, f. 90 b.] And therefore the Jews hold the resurrection for one of the foundations of the Law of Moses; ותחיית המתים קאתרה מן קואתר שריעה משא *Moses Maimon. Expl. cap.* 10. *Tract. Sanhedrin**.

* [A translation into Hebrew of the commentary of Maimonides may be found in the Talmud after the Perek Chelek. In the Vienna edit. of 1832 the quotation is near the end of f. 125. col. 4, thus; ותחיית המתים הוא יסוד מיסודי משה—R. P. S.]

heard the voice of Elijah for the dead child of the widow of Sarepta, *and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived.* Him did Elisha succeed, not only in the same spirit, but also in the like power, for he raised the child of the Shunamite from death: nor did that power die together with him; for when they were burying a dead man, *they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet.* These three examples were so many confirmations, under the Law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we have three to equal them under the Gospel. When the daughter of Jairus was dead, Christ *said unto her, Talitha cumi, Damsel, arise; and her spirit came again, and straightway the damsel arose.* When he came *nigh to the gate of the city called Naim, there was a dead man carried out; and he came nigh and touched the bier, and said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise; and he that was dead sat up, and began to speak.* Thus Christ raised the dead in the chamber and in the street, from the bed and from the bier, and not content with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also to the grave. When Lazarus had been *dead four days,* and so buried that his sister said of him, *By this time he stinketh; Jesus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth; and he that was dead came forth.* These three evangelical resuscitations are so many preambulary proofs of the last and general resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of the resurrection of him who raised these.

1 Kings xvii. 22.
2 Kings iv.
2 Kings xiii. 21.
Mark v. 41, 42. Luke viii. 55: vii. 12, 14, 15.
John xi. 39, 43, 44.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actual testimony of the resurrection. For *if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead,* saith St. Paul to the Corinthians, *how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?* If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that Christ did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confess that some particular persons did return to life after death[44], they could

1 Cor. xv. 12.

[44] There were not only certain persons under the Law, and among the Jews, who were raised to life; but there were also histories amongst the Gentiles of several who rose to life after death. We mentioned before [p. 466, note 19.] one out of Plutarch, who rose the third day; and Plato mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death: Ἀλλ' οὐ μέντοι σοὶ, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, Ἀλκίνου

not rationally deny the resurrection wholly. Now the resurrection of Christ doth not only prove by way of example, as the
380 rest who rose, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future general resurrection. For God *hath appointed a day in* Acts xvii. 31.
which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because *Christ is risen.* And 1 Cor. xv. 20, 21, 22.
since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

This consequence of a future resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a general or a particular consideration. In a general reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the elect alone. First, it belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that dominion of which Christ at his resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. *For to this end Christ both died and rose and* Rom. xiv. 9.
revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. Now as *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living,* so Christ is Matt. xxii. 32.
not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them, and rule them when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion entered upon at his resurrection *he must* 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.
reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet, and *the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death,* and there is no destruction of death but by a general resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to St. John, *I am he that liveth* Rev. i. 18.
and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death. Thus are we assured of a general resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly, Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a general resurrection in respect of the judgment which is to follow. For as *it is appointed for all men once to die,* so *after* death *cometh* Heb. ix. 27.
judgment; and as Christ was raised that he might be Judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As therefore

γε ἀπόλογον ἐρῶ, ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μὲν ἀνδρὸς, Ἥρδος τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γένος Παμφύλου· ὃς ποτε ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτήσας, ἀναιρεθέντων δεκαταίων τῶν νεκρῶν ἤδη διεφθαρμένων, ὑγιὴς μὲν ἀνῃρέθη, κομισθεὶς δὲ οἴκαδε, μέλλων θάπτεσθαι, δωδεκαταῖος ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ κείμενος ἀνεβίω. *Plat. de Repub. lib.* x. [p. 614 B.] *Vide Plin. Nat. Hist. lib.* vii. *cap.* 53. *De his qui elati revixerunt.*

Acts xvii. 31. God gave an *assurance to all men,* that he would judge the world *by that man, in that he raised him from the dead,* so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgment.

Now as the general resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more especial and peculiar manner the resurrection of the chosen saints and servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not only as their Lord and Judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body (for *He is the head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead*); as the *first-fruits,* by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted, for *now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept.* The saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost; now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the resurrection of a Christian. For *if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in* us, *he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken* our *mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in* us.

Col. i. 18.

1 Cor. xv. 20.

Rom. viii. 11.

Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actual raising of several persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that *the resurrection of the body* is, in itself considered, possible, upon general considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

But as it is necessary to a resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man, so it is also necessary that 381
the same flesh should be raised again; for if either the same body should be joined to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviour's testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entered into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other souls. If the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they do, and when the resurrection

should be performed, the bodies should be informed with other souls; neither they who lived before then should revive, and those who live after the resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same souls should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this only true of our souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man, shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died; that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day; that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again, that the same temple which was destroyed shall be rebuilt, is most apparent out of the same word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any resurrection. *Though after my skin worms destroy* Job xix. *this body*, saith Job, *yet in my flesh* (*in flesh*, shewing the reality, 26, 27. *in my flesh*, shewing the propriety and identity) *shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another*, or a *stranger*, eye[45]. *He that raised up Christ from the* Rom. viii. *dead shall also quicken* our *mortal bodies*: after the resurrection 11. our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but in the resurrection of our mortal bodies, those bodies, by reason of whose mortality we died, shall be revived. *For this* 1 Cor. xv. *corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on* 53. *immortality*[46]. But *this corruptible* and *this mortal* is the same

[45] 'Quid hac prophetia manifestius? Nullus tam aperte post Christum, quam iste ante Christum de resurrectione loquitur.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 61. *ad Pammach.* [Lib. cont. Joann. Hieros. 30. vol. ii. p. 438 A.]

[46] Ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσας τις ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσει, νομίσῃ τὰ σώματα μὴ ἀνίστασθαι, ἐπήγαγεν, ὅτι δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν· φθαρτὸν δὲ τὸ σῶμα καὶ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα· ὥστε τὸ σῶμα μένει· αὐτὸ γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐνδυόμενον, ἡ δὲ θνητότης καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἀφανίζεται, ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἐπιυύσης αὐτῷ. *S. Chrysost. ad lo-*

body which dieth, because *mortal;* and is corrupted, because *corruptible;* the soul then, at the resurrection of that man which is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

The identity of the body raised from death is so necessary, that the very name of the resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death of 382
Eccles. iii. 21. man nothing falleth but his body[17], the *spirit goeth upward*, and

cum. [Hom. XLII. §. 2. vol. x. p. 396 E.] Ὁρᾷς τὴν ἀκρίβειαν· τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἔδειξε δεικτικῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἄλλης νομίσῃς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν. *Theodoret.* 'Oportet enim corruptivum istud induere incorruptionem, et mortale istud induere immortalitatem. Quid mortale, nisi caro? quid corruptivum, nisi sanguis? Ac ne putes aliud sentire Apostolum providentem tibi, et, ut de carne dictum intelligas, laborantem; quum dicit, *istud corruptivum*, et, *istud mortale*, cutem ipsam tenens dicit. Certe *istud* nisi de subjecto, nisi de comparenti pronuntiasse non potuit: demonstrationis corporalis est verbum.' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 51. [p. 357 D.] 'Sed et Apostolus cum dicit, *Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem*, numquid non corpus suum quodammodo contingentis et digito palpantis est vox? Hoc ergo quod nunc corruptibile corpus est, resurrectionis gratia incorruptibile erit, et hoc quod nunc mortale est immortalitatis virtutibus induetur.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 45. p. ccxxx.] 'Quod vero dicit Apostolus, *corruptibile hoc et mortale*, hoc ipsum corpus, id est, carnem, quæ tunc videbatur, ostendit. Quod autem copulat, *induere incorruptionem et immortalitatem*, illud indumentum, id est, vestimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornat in gloria; sed quod ante inglorium fuit, efficere gloriosum.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 61. [Lib. cont. Joan. Hieros. 29. vol. ii. p. 436 E.]

47 Περὶ δὲ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, πῶς οὐχὶ σαρκὸς ἔσται ἀνάστασις, ὦ ἐθελόσοφε Ἱέρακα; Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ ὀνομασία τῆς φράσεως δείκνυσι τὴν δύναμιν. Ἀνάστασις γὰρ οὐ καλεῖται τοῦ μὴ πεπτωκότος· ποῖον δέ ἐστι τὸ πεσόν; ποῖον τὸ ταφέν; ποῖον τὸ λυθέν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ σῶμα; καὶ οὐχ ἡ ψυχή· ψυχὴ τοίνυν οὐ πίπτει, οὔτε θάπτεται. *Epiph. Hæres.* lxvii. §. 6. [vol. ii. p. 714 B.] 'Nam et ipsum quod *mortuorum resurrectio* dicitur, exigit defendi proprietates vocabulorum. *Mortuorum* itaque vocabulo non est, nisi quod amisit animam, de cujus facultate vivebat. Corpus est quod amittit animam, et amittendo fit mortuum: ita *mortui* vocabulum corpori competit. Porro, si resurrectio mortui est, mortuum autem non aliud est quam corpus, corporis erit resurrectio. Sic et *resurrectionis* vocabulum non aliam rem vindicat, quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim potest dici et quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper retro jacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim surgendo quia cecidit, resurgere dicitur. *Re* enim syllaba iterationi semper adhibetur.' *Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib.* v. *cap.* 9. [p. 471 D.] 'Sed et ipsum *resurrectionis* vocabulum significat non aliud ruere, aliud suscitari; et quod adjicitur *mortuorum*, carnem propriam demonstrat: quod enim in homine moritur, hoc et vivificatur.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 61. [§. 33. p. 442 C.] 'Si id resurgere dicitur, quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in veritate resurgit, sicut in veritate cadit.' *Gennad. de Dogm. Eccles. c.* 6. [p. 76 C.] Πῶς γὰρ ἀναστήσεται ἡ μὴ πεπτωκυῖα ψυχή; ἀνάστασις δὲ πῶς αὐτῆς κληθήσεται, τῆς μὴ πεσούσης ψυχῆς; πᾶν γὰρ τὸ πίπτον ἀναστάσεως δεῖται· πίπτει δὲ οὐχ ἡ ψυχή, ἀλλὰ σῶμα· ὅθεν καὶ δικαίως πτῶμα αὐτὸ ἡ συνήθεια εἴωθε καλεῖν. *S. Epiph. Hæres.* xlii. §. 5. [vol. ii. p. 305 C.] Ἀνάστασιν δὲ σωμάτων περιμένομεν· τοῦτο

no other body falleth but his own; and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again, to make a resurrection. If we look upon it under the notion of reviviscency, which is more ordinary in the Hebrew language[48], it proves as much; for nothing properly dieth but the body, the soul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dieth. Or to speak more punctually, the man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell; man dieth not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body; and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in reference to his body before deprived of life; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

Again, the description of the place from whence the resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which *sleep in the dust of the earth*, they which *are in the graves*[49], shall hear the voice and rise: *The sea* shall *give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them.* But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in

Dan. xii. 2. John v. 28. Rev. xx. 13.

γὰρ καὶ ἡ προσηγορία δηλοῖ. Ἀνάστασις γὰρ ἡ ἄνωθεν στάσις· τὸ σῶμα δέ ἐστι τὸ φθειρόμενον καὶ διαλυόμενον, καὶ εἰς χοῦν μεταβαλλόμενον·——τούτου τοίνυν ἡ ἄνωθεν σύστασις εἰκότως καλεῖται ἀνάστασις· τῆς γὰρ δὴ ἀθανάτου ψυχῆς οὐκ ἀνάστασις, ἀλλ' ἐπάνοδος γίγνεται πρὸς τὸ σῶμα. *S. Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. lib.* v. *cap.* 19. [vol. iv. p. 293 A.] *Vide Iren. lib.* v. *cap.* 7.

48 The Rabbins use sometimes תקומה, which is properly *resurrection*, ἀνάστασις; according to that of our Saviour, *Talitha cumi;* but more often they make use of תחיה, which is *reviviscentia*, ἀναβίωσις. And though they make a distinction sometimes between them, attributing the first to the wicked, the second to the just; yet it must not be so understood as if there could be a reviviscency without a resurrection, a תחיה without a תקומה, but that there is to the wicked a תקומה which cannot so properly be called תחיה, because they rise not to the happiness of eternal life.

49 This argument is so cogent, that the Socinians are forced to deny that Christ spake of the resurrection; affirming that the graves of ignorance and impiety are only there intended, and rising is nothing else but coming to the knowledge of Christ by the preaching of the gospel. Whereas Christ expressly speaks of bringing men to judgment, *v.* 27. and divides those which are to come out of the graves into two ranks, neither of which can be so understood. The first are those *which have done good*, before they come out of the graves; these therefore could not be the graves of ignorance and impiety, from which no good can come. The second are such who *have done evil*, and so remain as evil-doers, and therefore cannot be said to have come forth out of the graves of ignorance and impiety, or to rise by the preaching of the gospel to newness of life, because they are expressly said to come forth *unto the resurrection of damnation.*

the dust should not revive: if God should give us any other bodies than our own, neither the sea nor the grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the grave gives up; the grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which is buried, at the last day shall be revived.

The immediate consequent of the resurrection proveth the
1 Cor. v. 10. identity of the dying and rising body, *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body: that which shall receive the reward, and be liable to the punishment, is not only the soul but the body; it stands not therefore with the nature of a just retri- 383
bution, that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another[50], he which pleased God in his own flesh should see
Matt. x. 28. God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall *destroy both*
1 Cor. vi. 20. their *soul and body in hell:* but they which *glorify God in* their *body and* their *spirit, which are God's,* shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit; for they are both *bought* with the same *price,* even the blood of Christ. The bodies of the saints
1 Cor. vi. 15, 19. are the *members of Christ,* and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost,* and therefore
Rom. viii. 11. if they be destroyed, they shall be raised again. For *if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in* us, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, *he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken* our *mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in* us.

Furthermore, the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise, because they

50 'Quam absurdum, quam vero et iniquum; utrumque autem quam Deo indignum, aliam substantiam operari, aliam mercede dispungi: ut hæc quidem caro per martyria lanietur, alia vero coronetur: item e contrario, hæc quidem caro in spurcitiis volutetur, alia vero damnetur. Nonne præstat omnem semel fidem a spe resurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque justitia Dei ludere? Marcionem pro Valentino resuscitari?' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 56. [p. 361 A.] And speaking to the soul of man; 'Affirmamus te manere post vitæ dispunctionem, et expectare diem judicii, proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari, aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam, ejusdemque hominis materiam et memoriam reversuram, quod et nihil mali ac boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate, et nulla ratio sit judicii, sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit judicii passionem.' *Idem, de Testim. Anim. cap.* 4. [p. 66 B.]

shall never die. This may be considered not only in the translations of Enoch and Elias[51], but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change; *the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord.* If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the *Judge of the quick and the dead.* Otherwise the saints which shall be with God and with the Lamb for evermore would be chequered with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

Acts x. 42.

Lastly, those examples which God hath been pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the resurrection, do at the same time persuade us that the same body which died shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three examples of the Old Testament, or those of the New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death; it is written that *the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose and came out of their graves,* certainly the same bodies which were laid in. If then they were to us examples of the resurrection to come[52], as certainly they were, then must they resemble in their substance

Iren. lib. v. c. 13.

Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.

51 'Enoch translatus est in carne: Elias carneus raptus est in cœlum: necdum mortui et paradisi jam coloni, habent membra cum quibus rapti sunt atque translati.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 61. [Lib. cont. Joan. Hieros. §. 29. vol. ii. p. 437 C.]

52 'Post dicta Domini, facta etiam ejus quid sapere credamus, de capulis, de sepulchris, mortuos resuscitantis? cui rei istud? Si ad simplicem ostentationem potestatis, aut ad præsentem gratiam redanimationis, non adeo magnum illi denuo morituros suscitare. Enimvero, si ad fidem potius sequestrandam futuræ resurrectionis, ergo et illa corporalis præscribitur, de documenti sui forma.' *Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap.* 38. [p. 348 A.] 'At ego Deum malo decipere non posse, de fallacia solummodo infirmum, ne aliter documenta præmisisse, quam rem disposuisse videatur; imo, ne si exemplum resurrectionis sine carne non valuit inducere, multo magis plenitudinem exempli in eadem substantia exhibere non possit. Nullum vero exemplum majus est eo, cujus exemplum est. Majus est autem, si animæ cum corpore resuscitabuntur in documentum sine corpore resurgendi; ut tota hominis salus dimidiæ patrocinaretur: quando exemplorum conditio illud potius expeteret, quod minus haberetur; animæ dico solius resurrectionem, velut gustum carnis etiam resurrecturæ suo in tempore.' *Ibid.*

after they lived again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And being Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*, and declared it to be his own body saying, *Behold, my hands and my feet, that it is I myself*, being *he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;* it followeth that we shall rise in the same bodies as our Saviour did[53], that every particular person at the resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, *Behold it is I myself.*

John ii. 19. Luke xxiv. 39. Phil. iii. 21. 384

We can therefore no otherwise expound this Article, teaching *the resurrection of the body*, than by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance, but of their qualities[54]. Which explication is most agreeable to the language of the Scriptures, to the principles of religion, to the constant profession of the Church, against the Origenists of old, and the Socinians of late.

Having hitherto proved the certainty of this Article, that there shall be a resurrection, and declared the verity and propriety of it, that it shall be the *resurrection* of the same *body* which was dead; we may now proceed farther to inquire into the latitude of the same, to whom the resurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the revelation of this truth under the Law, and under the Gospel; Christ proved out of the Law that there should be a resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no farther than unto the people of God,

53 'Expectamus in hujus morte et sanguine emundatos remissionem peccatorum consecuturos: resuscitandos nos ab eo in his corporibus, et in eadem carne qua nunc sumus, sicut et ipse in eadem qua natus et passus et mortuus est resurrexit.' So we read in the Creed which by some is attributed to St. Athanasius, by others to St. Gregory Nazianzen. 'Si ad exemplum Christi resurgamus qui resurrexit in carne, jam non ad exemplum Christi resurgemus si non in carne et ipsi resurgemus.'

54 'Hæc est vera resurrectionis confessio, quæ sic gloriam carni tribuit, ut non auferat veritatem.' *S. Hieron. Epist.* 61. [§. 29. vol. ii. p. 436 E.] 'Cum igitur ita evidens, et (ut ita dicam) palpabile et manu attrectandum nobis Christus dederit suæ resurrectionis exemplum; ita aliquis insanit, ut aliter se resurrecturum putet, quam resurrexerit ille qui primus resurrectionis aditum patefecit?' *Ruffin. Invect. in S. Hieron. lib.* i. [§. 4. in S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 587 E.] 'Nostri autem illud quoque recogitent, corpora eadem recepturas in resurrectione animas, in quibus decesserunt.' *Tertull. de Anim. cap.* 56. [p. 305 B.]

because it is grounded upon those words, *I am the God of Abra-* Exod. iii. 6.
ham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Job speaketh most expressly of the resurrection, but mentioneth no other than his Redeemer and himself. The place of Daniel, which was always accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth* Dan. xii. 2.
shall awake. From whence the Jews most generally have believed that some men should live again, and some should not; because it is written, *Many shall awake,* but it is not written, *All shall awake.* Nay, some of them have gone so far by way of restriction, that they have maintained a resurrection of the just alone, according to that ancient saying accepted amongst them, that the *sending of the rain is of the just and unjust, but the resurrection of the dead is of the just alone*[55]. Against which two restrictions, by the light delivered in the Gospel, we shall deliver the latitude of this Article in these two propositions: first, the resurrection of the dead belongeth not unto the just alone, but to the unjust also: secondly, the resurrection of the dead belongeth not only to some of the just, but to all the just; not to some of the unjust only, but to all the unjust, even unto all the dead.

For the first, it is most evident, not only out of the New, but also out of the Old Testament: the words of Daniel prove it sufficiently; for of those *many* which *shall awake, some* shall rise *to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.* But it is most certain that the just shall never rise *to shame and everlasting contempt;* therefore it is most evident that some shall
385 awake and rise beside the just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by St. Paul's apology to Felix; *But this I confess unto thee, that I have hope* Acts xxiv.
towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be 14, 15.
a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment; the first unto a resurrection, called in reference unto them, *the resurrection of life*[56]; the second unto a resur- John v. 29.
rection, named in relation unto them, *the resurrection of damnation.* For as there is *a resurrection of the just,* so there must

[55] This is recorded in the *Bereshit Rabba. Vide Maimon. Expl. cap.* 10. *Tract. Sanhed.*

[56] Ἀνάστασις ζωῆς and Ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. The first is called Ἀνάστασις δικαίων, and therefore the second may as well be called Ἀνάστασις ἀδίκων.

also be *a resurrection of the unjust;* that as Christ said unto
Luke xiv. 14. the charitable person, *Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just:* so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, Thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the unjust. For there shall be a resurrection that there may be a judgment, and at the judgment there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of man, and goats on the left; therefore they both shall
Matt. xxv. 34. rise, those, that they may receive that blessing, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;* these, that they may receive that sentence,
Verse 41. *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.* At that resurrection then which we believe, there shall rise both just and unjust.

Secondly, As no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded: whosoever dieth is numbered with the just or unjust. Adam,
1 Cor. xv. 22. the first of men, shall rise, and all which come from him. *For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called *the resurrection of the dead*
Verse 21. indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. *By man came death, by man came the resurrection of the dead,* and so the resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall *destroy death,* but if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are express and
John v. 28, 29. full, *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.* In the description of the judgment
Matt. xxv. 31, 32. which followeth upon the resurrection, *when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory,* it is said that *before him shall be*
Rom. xiv. 10. *gathered all nations. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,* and if so, the dead must all arise, for they are all fallen.
2 Cor. v. 10. *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil;* and before we all appear, the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the latitude of the resurrection; the resurrection of the dead is the resurrection of all the dead, or of all mankind[57].

[57] Irenæus in his rule of faith; Ἐπὶ ἀναστῆσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος. τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ *Adv. Hæres. lib.* i. *cap.* 2. [c. 10.

Now this resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurition of it. There were heretics in the Apostles' days, who acknowledged a resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation
386 of it to the time to come, as *Hymenæus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some*[58]. To believe it already past, is to deny it; because it cannot be believed past, but by such an interpretation as must destroy it. As they which interpret this resurrection of the likeness of Christ's resurrection, that as he died and rose again, so we should die unto sin and live again unto righteousness, attributing all to the renovation of the mind, must deny *the resurrection of the body*.

2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.

Now as we know the doctrine of the resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come; so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the world; because, as Martha called it, it is *the resurrection at the last day*. Job, who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the *latter day;* Christ hath no otherwise declared *his Father's will,* than that *of all which he hath given* him, he *should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day*. The corn is sown and laid in the ground, and *the harvest is the end of the world*. We must not expect to rise from the dead

John xi. 24.

John vi. 39.

Matt. xiii. 39.

§. 1. p. 48.] and Theophilus calls it τὴν καθολικὴν ἀνάστασιν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων. *Ad. Autol. lib.* i. [c. 13. p. 346 A.]

58 'Nonnulli enim attendentes verba quæ assidue dicit Apostolus, *Quia et mortui sumus cum Christo, et resurreximus cum eo;* nec intelligentes quatenus dicantur, arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem, nec ullam ulterius in fine temporum esse sperandam. *Ex quibus est,* inquit, *Hymenæus et Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem jam factam esse, et fidem quorundam subverterunt.* Idem Apostolus eos arguens detestatur, qui tamen dicit nos resurrexisse cum Christo.' *S. August. Epist.* cxix. *ad Januar. cap.* 3. [Epist. LV. 4. vol. ii. p. 129 C.] This was the heresy of the *Seleuciani* or *Hermiani,* as the same St. Augustin testifies; 'Resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum.' *Hæres.* 59. [vol. viii. p. 20 D.] Thus Tertullian relates of some heretics in his time, who made the resurrection wholly allegorical, and yet pretended to believe a resurrection in the flesh, but understood it in this life at the baptismal renovation, and so past when they professed to believe. 'Exinde ergo, resurrectionem fide consecutos cum Domino esse, quum eum in baptismate induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis sæpe nostros decipere consuerunt: quasi et ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquiunt, qui non in hac carne resurrexerit: ne statim illos percutiant, si resurrectionem statim abnuerint. Tacite autem, secundum conscientiam suam, hoc sentiunt, Væ qui non, dum in carne est, cognoverit arcana hæretica: hoc est enim apud illos resurrectio.' *De Resur. Carn. cap.* 19. [p. 336 C.]

1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thess. iv. 16. John v. 28. Acts xvii. 31. till *the last trump. The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of God,* before *all that are in the graves shall hear his voice.* God shall *judge the world,* and therefore shall raise the world; but he will not raise them to that judgment till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a resurrection; that the resurrection which was revealed is the resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead, or shall hereafter die; that this resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this Article.

The value of this truth, the necessity of this doctrine, will appear; first, in the illustration of the glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his wisdom, power, justice, and mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the resurrection is as it were a new creation. The wisdom and power of God are manifested in this acknowledgment, inasmuch as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individual dust of all the bodies of all men; and without an infinite power he could not conjoin, cement, conglutinate and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The mercy and justice of God are declared by the same profession; the mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved; the justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient 387
Isa. lxvi. 14. with everlasting flames. *When ye see this,* saith the Prophet, *your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies.*

Secondly, It is necessary to profess the belief of *the resurrection of the body,* that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerful work of our redemption, confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have
2 Tim. i. 10. obtained another life, had not the Saviour of the world *abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.* If Christ were not *the life,* the dead could never live; if he were not *the resurrection,* they could never rise. Were it not for him
Rev. i. 18. *that liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore,* had not he *the keys of hell and of death,* we could never break through the bars

of death, or pass the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our *last enemy* to be *destroyed is death:* that the prophecy may be fulfilled, *Death is swallowed up in victory,* and we may cry out with the Apostle, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, 57. Hos. xiii. 14.

Thirdly, The belief of this Article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death, passed upon us for our sins, cannot but affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature, upon the comforts proceeding from our faith. The departure of our friends might overwhelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the Apostle will *not have* us *ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that* we *sorrow not even as others which have no hope.* 1 Thess. iv. 13.

Fourthly, The belief of the resurrection hath a necessary reflection upon this life, by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin, while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the judgment-seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter, except it here become the temple of the Holy Ghost? St. Paul, who hath delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. *I have hope,* saith he, *towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.* This is the proper work of a true belief, and a full persuasion of a resurrection; and he which is really possessed with this hope, cannot choose but purify himself: *always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as* he *knoweth that* his *labour is not in vain in the Lord.* This encourageth all drooping spirits, this sustaineth all fainting hearts, this sweeteneth all present miseries, this lighteneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities. Acts xxiv. 15, 16. 1 Cor. xv. 58.

Having thus discovered the truth of this Article, we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to profess, when he confesseth a belief of *the resurrection of the body;* for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much: I am fully persuaded of this as of a most necessary and infallible 388
truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death, that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves, and reunited to their souls, that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise, that this resuscitation shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave, that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation; that this shall be performed at the last day when the trump shall sound; and thus *I believe the resurrection of the body.*

ARTICLE XII. 389

And the Life everlasting.

THIS last Article, though not to be found in all[59], yet was

59 Not in all; for divers ended with that of the resurrection, as appeareth by Ruffinus; who not only expounded the Aquileian Creed, but collated it with the Greek and Roman, and yet makes no mention of this Article, but concludes with that of the resurrection. 'Sed et ultimus iste sermo qui resurrectionem carnis pronunciat, summam totius perfectionis succincta brevitate concludit.' *Expos. in Symb.* [§. 41. p. ccxxvii.] And whereas he shews the custom of the Aquileian Church to make a cross upon their forehead at the naming of *hujus carnis*, he tells us elsewhere in his Apology against St. Jerom, that it was to conclude the Creed. 'Quo scilicet frontem, ut mos est, in fine symboli signaculo contingentes, et ore carnis hujus videlicet quam contingimus resurrectionem fatentes, omnem venenatæ adversum nos linguæ calumniandi aditum perstruamus.' [In S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 587 E.] In the same manner St. Jerom his contemporary; 'In symbolo fidei et spei nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum, non scribitur in charta et atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem Trinitatis et unitatem Ecclesiæ, omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur.' *Epist.* 61. [Lib. cont. Joan. Hieros. §. 28. vol. ii. p. 435 E.] So St. Chrysostom; Μετὰ τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν τῶν μυστικῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων καὶ φοβερῶν, καὶ τοὺς φρικτοὺς κανόνας τῶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατενεχθέντων δογμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τῷ τέλει προστίθεμεν, ὅταν μέλλωμεν βαπτίζειν, κελεύοντες λέγειν ὅτι πιστεύω εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει ταύτῃ βαπτιζόμεθα· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ὁμολογῆσαι τοῦτο

expressed in many ancient Creeds[60]: in some by way of addition, *and the life everlasting;* in others by way of conjunction with the former, *the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life.* Upon this connexion with the former will follow the true interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we are persuaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the resurrection in the world to come.

As therefore St. Paul hath taught us to express our belief of *a resurrection both of the just and the unjust,* so after the resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both; of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt; and so those who first acknowledged this Article did interpret it[61]. Although therefore *life everlasting,* as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise than as a reward

μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων, τότε καθιέμεθα εἰς τὴν πηγὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων ἐκείνων. *Homil.* 40. *in* 1 *ad Corinth.* [§. 1. vol. x. p. 379 B.] So Maximus Taurinensis after those words, 'Carnis resurrectionem,' adds, 'Hic religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est.' [p. 40 F.] And Venantius Fortunatus after the same words, 'Summa perfectionis concluditur.' [lib. xi. 1. p. 482 F.] And in the MS. set forth by the bishop of Armagh, Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν and 'Carnis resurrectione' are the last words.

60 As Petrus Chrysologus expressly; 'Credimus *vitam æternam;* quia post resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est, nec malorum. Signate vos.' *Serm.* 60. [p. 706 A.] And again; 'Bene addidit, *vitam æternam,* ut se resurrecturum crederet, qui resurget per ipsum, qui cum Deo Patre et Spiritu Sancto vivit et regnat.' *Serm.* 62. [p. 708 B.] So Etherius Uxamensis, and Eusebius Gallicanus. So we find *Serm. de Temp.* 131. [al. CCXLII.] and *De Symb. ad Catechum. lib.* i. *cap.* 9. [S. Aug. vol. vi. p. 556 B.] 'Quomodo *Carnis resurrectionem?* Ne forte putet aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic esse, additum est, *in vitam æternam.*' And, *lib.* ii. *cap.* 12. [p. 567 E.] 'Hoc sequitur etiam in isto sancto symbolo, quod post *Resurrectionem carnis* credamus et *in vitam æternam.*' *Lib.* iii. cap. 12. [p. 574 G.] *In vita æterna;* and *lib.* iv. *cap.* 12. [p. 582 A.] 'Hoc sequitur in sancto symbolo, quod omnia quæ credimus et speramus *in vita æterna* percipiamus.' And Carolus Magnus in his reprehension of Basilius bishop of Ancyra; 'Non eo modo præjudicat prætermissio imaginum adorationis sacræ fidei puritati, quæ interdicta potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicant Remissio peccatorum, Carnis resurrectio, et Vita futuri sæculi, si in confessione prætermittantur; quæ utique et in omni Scripturarum serie prædicantur, et ab Apostolis in symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur.' *Capitul. lib.* iii. *cap.* 6. *Anonymus in Homilia sacra* set forth by Elmenhorstius with Gennadius [p. 47. ed. Hamb. 1614.]; 'Post istam abrenunciationem nos interrogati a sacerdote, Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ? unusquisque respondit, Credo. Credis et in Dominum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum natum ex Maria virgine passum et sepultum? et respondit, Credo. Tertia interrogatio, Credis et Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, Sanctorum communionem, Remissionem peccatorum, Carnis resurrectionem, et Vitam æternam? et respondit unusquisque nostrûm, Credo.'

61 As appeareth by those words of Chrysologus; 'Credimus vitam æternam, quia post resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est, nec malorum.' *Serm.* 60. [p. 706 A.]

promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord; yet the same words may be used to express the duration of any persons which live never to die again, whatsoever their state and condition in itself shall be. For as *the resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternal condition
Phil. iii. 11. which followeth after it, as when the Apostle saith, *If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead*[62]; which 390
he must needs be most certain to attain unto, who believed the resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the resurrection in general, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, *If by any means*, nor that which went before, *the fellowship of Christ's sufferings*, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead; but he meant that resurrection which followeth upon the being *made conformable unto his death*, which is a resurrection in conformity to the resurrection of Christ. As, I say, *the resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scripture for everlasting happiness, and yet the same language is and may be used for the general resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; so *the life everlasting*[63], though used for a reward given only unto the elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life,

62 Phil. iii. 11. Though in this place it is not barely ἀνάστασις, but ἐξανάστασις, Εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν, and in the Alexandrian MS. Εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, which is the most ancient reading, as appeareth by the vulgar translation, *Si quo modo occurram ad resurrectionem, quæ est ex mortuis;* and the reading of Tertullian, *Si qua concurram in resuscitationem quæ est a mortuis: De Resur. Carn. cap.* 23. [p. 339 A.] and the Syriac translation, לקימתא דמן בירת מיתא, yet the ἐξανάστασις of itself was taken for no more than ἀνάστασις by any of the translators. And St. Chrysostom did so understand it, as appeareth by these words on the place, [Hom. xi. §. 3. vol. xi. p. 287 A.] Εἴ πως καταντήσω, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν· (which is the reading of the Alexandrian MS.) τί λέγεις; καὶ μὴν πάντες αὐτῆς τυγχάνουσι, πάντες μὲν γὰρ οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, φησὶ, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, καὶ οὐκ ἀναστάσεως μόνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας πάντες, οἱ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐφόδιον κολάσεως. Εἰ τοίνυν πάντες τῆς ἀναστάσεως τυγχάνουσι, καὶ οὐ τῆς ἀναστάσεως μόνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας, πῶς ὡς μέλλων ἐξαιρέτου τινὸς τυγχάνειν ἔλεγες, Εἴ πως καταντήσω; By which it appeareth that St. Chrysostom took no notice of the word ἐξανάστασις, or of the phrase ἡ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, but as the interpretation of the Apostle's intention addeth, Ποίαν ἐνταῦθα ἀνάστασίν φησι; τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄγουσαν τὸν Χριστόν. So also Theodoret's paraphrase; Ἵνα μετάσχω καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. It is therefore, I conceive, a notion peculiar to Theophylact among the Greeks, Πάντες μὲν ἀνίστανται, οὐ πάντες δὲ καὶ ἐξανίστανται. *Ad locum.* [p. 608.]

63 'Sed sciendum est quia omnes et boni et mali resurgere habent ad vitam, sed non omnes resurgent ad gloriam.' *Ruffin. Com. in Psal.* i. [p. 5.]

and after the resurrection live by a true vital union of their souls unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be dissolved, because *it is appointed for men once to die,* and after their reviviscency never to die again, it followeth that the life which they shall live must be an *everlasting life.* Heb. ix. 27.

To begin then with the resurrection to condemnation; the truth included in this Article, in reference unto that, is to this effect, that those who die in their sins, and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergo the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two ways this eternity may be denied; one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the torments must likewise cease; the other, by a suspension or relaxation of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelations of the justice of God against the disobedience of man.

Our first assertion therefore is, that the wicked after the day of judgment shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their opinion, not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the heathens did[64], but as a truth delivered in the Scriptures; as if the word itself taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment: as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing atheist expects, that is, after death never to be again; or if they be, as it were in a moment to lose that being for ever. Because the Scripture
391 speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and die; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter

64 Μάχεται ἀθάνατος φύσις ἀλγηδόσι καὶ βασάνοις, ἐπείπερ πᾶν τὸ ἀλγοῦν θνητόν ἐστιν. *Sext. Empir. adv. Mathemat. p.* 321 D.

far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense will they understand those words of Christ, (so full of terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked in their exposition,) *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell*[65]. If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition only, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition only, excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost and dead, who is rejected, separated and disjoined from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vital union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases, or expressions give any comfort to the wicked or strength to this opinion, if the same Scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, say also that they shall be tormented with never-dying pains, as they plainly and frequently do.

Matt. x. 28.

Matt. xxv. 41. *Depart from me, ye cursed,* shall the Judge eternal say to all the reprobate, *into everlasting fire*[66]; and lest any should imagine that the fire shall be eternal, but the torments not, it follow-

Verse 46. eth, *and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Now the *life eternal* may as well be affirmed to have an

65 'Locus Matthæi x. 28. perditionem tantum animæ in gehenna, non cruciatum denunciat.' *Smalcius cont. Meisner.* 'Igni æterno illi Christi hostes—qui quidem sunt Diabolus et angeli ipsius, vel saltem quorum nomine isti quoque continentur, cruciabuntur, et ita delebuntur.' *Crell. Com. in* 1 *Cor.* xv. 24. [vol. i. p. 335.]

66 'Quibuscumque enim dixerit Dominus, *Discedite a me maledicti in ignem perpetuum,* isti erunt semper damnati: et quibuscumque dixerit, *Venite benedicti Patris mei, percipite hæreditatem regni quod præparatum est vobis in sempiternum,* hi semper percipiunt regnum, et proficiunt.' *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib.* iv. *cap.* 47. [c. 28. §. 3. p. 266.]

end, as the *everlasting punishment*, because they are both delivered in the same expression[67].

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the devil and his angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question only can be what that eternity doth signify. For, because some things are called in the Scriptures eternal which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing,
392 and that which cannot be extinguished can never end: but such is the fire which shall torment the reprobate; for he, *whose fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;* and hath taught us before, that *it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched;* and hath farther yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable description of the place of torments, *where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*[68]. And that we may be yet further assured that this fire shall be

Matt. iii. 12. Luke iii. 17. Matt. xviii. 8. Mark ix. 43, 44, 45, 46.

67 Καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον· οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Matt. xxv. 46. 'Antiquus iste persuasor in membris suis, id est, in mentibus iniquorum, futuras pœnas levigat, quas quasi certo fine determinat, ut eorum culpas sine termino correptionis extendat; et eo magis hic peccata non finiant, quo istic æstimant peccatorum supplicia finienda. Sunt enim nunc etiam, qui idcirco peccatis suis ponere finem negligunt, quia habere quandoque finem futura super se judicia suspicantur. Quibus breviter respondemus; si quandoque finienda sunt supplicia reproborum, quandoque finienda sunt ergo et gaudia beatorum: per semetipsam namque veritas dicit; *Ibunt hi in supplicium æternum, justi autem in vitam æternam.* Si igitur hoc verum non est quod minatus est, neque verum est illud quod promisit.' *S. Gregor. Magn. Moral. lib.* xxxiv. *cap.* 19. [vol. i. p. 1132 B.] 'Affirmamus te [anima] manere post vitæ dispunctionem, et expectare diem judicii, proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari, aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno.' *Tertull. de Testim. Animæ, cap.* 4. [p. 66 B.] 'Deus itaque judicabit plenius, quia extremius, per sententiam æternam tam supplicii quam refrigerii.' *Tertull. de Anima, cap.* 33. [p. 290 A.] 'Qui producto ævo isto judicaturus sit suos cultores in vitæ æternæ retributionem; profanos in ignem æque perpetem et jugem; suscitatis omnibus ab initio defunctis, et reformatis, et recensitis ad utriusque meriti dispunctionem.' *Apolog. cap.* 18. [p. 17 B.]

68 'Quid illum thesaurum ignis æterni æstimamus, quum fumariola quædam ejus tales flammarum ictus suscitent, ut proximæ urbes aut jam nullæ extent, aut idem sibi de die sperent? Dissiliunt superbissimi montes ignis intrinsecus fœtu; et, quod nobis judicii perpetuitatem probat, cum dissiliant, cum devorentur, nunquam tamen finiuntur.' *Tertull. de Pœnitent. cap.* 12. [p. 128 C.]

Rev. xiv. 11; xx. 10. never extinguished, we read that *the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever,* and that those which are *cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever*[69]; which expression of *day and night* is the same with that which declareth the eternal happiness in the heavens, Rev. iv. 8; vii. 15. where *they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy:* where *they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple.* If then the fire, in which the reprobates are to be tormented, be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched that the smoke thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever, (all which the Scriptures expressly teach,) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternal to the tormenting flames. And so this language of the Scriptures proves not only an effect eternal, as annihilation may be conceived, but an eternal efficient never ceasing to produce the same effect, which cannot be annihilation, but cruciation only. And therefore the fire which consumed Sodom and Gomorrha bears no proportion with the flames of hell: because all men know that fire is extinguished, nor doth the smoke thereof ascend for ever and ever.

Neither doth this only prove the eternity of infernal pains, but clearly refute the only material argument brought against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the wicked after the resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death; and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to die the second death, because Rev. ii. 11. they endure eternal torments. *He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the second death;* it seems that they which shall die that death shall be hurt by it: whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtful or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But the Rev. xx. 14, 15. living torments are the second death. For *Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death. Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire,* this is the second death. The Jews before our Saviour's time

69 Εἰς αἰῶνα δὲ αἰώνων αὐτὸν ἀναβαίνειν λέγεται, ἵνα μάθωμεν ἀτελεύτητον εἶναι τὴν κόλασιν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν τῶν δικαίων τρυφὴν αἰώνιον. *Andreas Cæsar. ad locum.*

believed there was a second death; and though it were not expressed in the oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received exposition of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to
393 come[70]; and what this punishment shall be, was in these words revealed to St. John; *But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.* Now if the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetual permansion in torment, as before is proved, then to say that the wicked shall die the second death is not a confutation of their eternal being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments, but delivered in other terms. Rev. xxi. 8.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or infer a conclusion of torment, much less will the bare phrases of *perdition* and *destruction;* for we may as well conclude that whosoever says he is *undone*, intends thereby that he shall be no more. Beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the Scripture signifies a perpetual perpession, and duration in misery. For when Christ shall come to *take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*, they *shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.* Wherefore I conclude, Ὄλλυμαι, *Perii.* 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.

[70] The Chaldee Paraphrase maketh often mention of it; as Deut. xxxiii. 6. *Let Reuben live and not die*, he expoundeth thus: יחי־ראובן בחיי־עלמא ומותא תנינא לא־ימות *Let Reuben live in life of the world, and not die the second death.* So the Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targum more expressly; יחי ראובן בעלמא הדין ולא ימות במותנא תנינא דבה מיתין רשעיא לעלמא דאתי *Let Reuben live in this world, and let him not die the second death, which the wicked die in the world to come.* So [the Targum of Jonathan on] Isa. xxii. 14. *Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die*, אם ישתבק חובא הדין לכון עד די תמותון מותא תנינא: and lxv. 6. *I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom;* לא אתן להון ארכא בחייא אלהן אשלם להון פורענות חוביהון ואמסור למותא תנינא ית נויתהון *I will not give them an end in (this) life, but will recompense them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to the second death.* From these and the like places it appeareth, that the Jews believed that the wicked after death should be delivered to a second death; that this death should be in the world to come; that they should by this death be punished for their sins. And St. John revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings: Καὶ θάνατοι δὲ ὡσαύτως δύο· ὁ μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς πρόσκαιρος· ὁ δὲ δι' ἁμαρτημάτων ἔκτισιν ἐπαγόμενος ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰώνιος, ὅσπερ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ πυρὸς γέεννα. *Andreas Cæsar. in Apocal.*

that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first assertion, against the covert doctrine of the Socinian[71].

The second assertion teacheth us, that as the reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the days of refreshment who are cast into perpetual burnings. One part of their misery is the horror of despair; and it were not perfect hell, if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and Abraham's bosom, that none could pass from one to other, what impossibility must there be when the final sentence is passed upon all! As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none which is once cast into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels, shall ever enter their Master's joy. As the tree falleth, so it lieth: there is no change to be wrought in man within 39
those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation

71 I call it covert, because it was at first closely delivered by Socinus, and some of his brethren did profess themselves to be scandalized at it, though he thought he had so delivered it that it should sooner be believed by his writings than perceived in them, as appeareth out of his sixth Epistle to Volkelius, who was offended at this doctrine, and seems never to have assented to it. 'Quod ais ea [in disputatione mea cum Puccio], tum de Christianorum resurrectione, tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quæ a multis sine magna offensione, tum nostris, tum alienis, legi non possint; scio equidem ista ibi contineri, sed, meo judicio, nec passim, nec ita aperte (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quisquam vir pius facile offendi possit; adeo ut, quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum mortem, in quo dogmate majus est multo offensionis periculum, ea potius ex iis colligi possit, quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse literis consignata extet; adeo ut lector, qui alioqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primi hominis, quæ toto libro agitatur, quæque ob non paucos quos habet fautores, parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest, probandum censeat, prius censeat doctrinam istam sibi jam persuasam esse, quam suaderi animadvertat.' [vol. i. p. 455.] Against this, Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople in his defence of Gregory Nyssen, shewed from the words of Christ, the Apostles, Prophets, and the Fathers, ὥσπερ αἰώνιον τὴν τῶν δικαίων ἀνεκλάλητον ἀπόλαυσιν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀτελεύτητόν τε καὶ ἀνυπόστατον κόλασιν. *Phot. Bibl. Cod.* 233. [p. 292 B.]

of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath *delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,* then shall the office of the Mediator cease. 1 Cor. xv. 24.

So groundless was the opinion of Origen, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such regions of the world as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that Christ shall be born and die again, (who being risen, *dieth no more,*) as that any person being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death, should ever come to live again, and by believing in the death of Christ to be after saved. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation is irreversible, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternal. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first; so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second assertion. Rom. vi. 9.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain and infallible doctrines in Christianity: That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by Christ, and delivered up under the curse, to be tormented with the devil and his angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved. That they shall be tormented with a pain of loss, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him. That they farther shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of loss, because there is no hope of heaven, under an eternal pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the Athanasian Creed, *They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.*

The next relation of this Article to the former is in reference to the resurrection of the just; and then *the life everlasting* is not to be taken in a vulgar and ordinary sense[72], but raised to the constant language of the Scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

Now this life eternal may be looked upon under three considerations; as initial, as partial, and as perfectional. I call that eternal life *initial*, which is obtained in this life, and is as it 39
were an earnest of that which is to follow: of which our Saviour
John v. 24. spake, *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.* I call that *partial*, which belongeth, though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is, the soul of the just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the joys be partial as to the soul, I am sure they are but partial as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the soul departed in the fear,
Phil. i. 23. and admitted to the presence of God. St. Paul had *a desire*
2 Cor. v. 8. *to depart and to be with Christ;* he was *willing rather to* travel and *be absent from the body, and to be present* and at home *with the Lord.* And certainly where St. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happiness which the saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *partial* life eternal. Thirdly, I call that *perfectional*, which shall be conferred upon the elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ,
Matt. xxv. 34. *Come, ye blessed* children *of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *eternal life* is to be considered in the possession, and in

72 'Eam quippe *vitam æternam* dicimus, ubi est sine fine felicitas. Nam si anima in pœnis vivit æternis, quibus et ipsi spiritus cruciabuntur immundi, mors est illa potius æterna quam vita. Nulla quippe major et pejor est mors, quam ubi non moritur mors.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* vi. *cap.* 12. [vol. vii. p. 162 A.] 'Quia *vita æterna* ab his qui familiaritatem non habent cum Scripturis sanctis, potest accipi etiam malorum vita; vel secundum quosdam etiam philosophos, propter animæ immortalitatem; vel etiam secundum fidem nostram, propter pœnas interminabiles impiorum, qui utique in æternum cruciari non poterunt, nisi etiam vixerint in æternum; profecto finis civitatis hujus, in quo summum habebit bonum, vel pax in vita æterna, vel vita æterna in pace dicendus est, ut facilius ab omnibus possit intelligi.' *Ibid. lib.* xix. *c.* 11. [p. 554 B.]

the duration; in the first, as it is *life*, in the second, as it is *eternal*. Now this life is not only natural, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the reprobate; but spiritual, which consisteth in the union of the soul to God[73], as our Saviour speaks, *He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an especial manner *life*, because of the happiness which attendeth it[74]: and therefore to understand that life is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happiness doth consist. 1 John v. 12.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; the bodies of the saints after the resurrection shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh *is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonour, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power; sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body.* This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, *who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is* 1 Cor. xv. 42, 43, 44. Phil. iii. 21.

73 'Duæ vitæ sunt, una corporis, altera animæ: sicut vita corporis anima, sic vita animæ Deus: quo modo si anima deserat, moritur corpus; sic anima moritur, si deserat Deus.' *S. Aug. Enar. in Psal.* lxx. *Serm.* 2. [§. 3. vol. iv. p. 736 A.]

74 For *Life* is taken for happiness, and *to live* for being happy. As among the Greeks and Latins ζῆν and *vivere* were taken for living a cheerful and merry life; as,

Vivamus, mea Lesbia,———

in Catullus, *Carm.* v. *ver.* 1.; and in Martial,

Sera nimis vita est crastina; vive hodie. Lib. i. Epigr. 16.

And as it is an old inscription, AMICI DUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS, and in the convivial wish, Ζήσειας, mentioned by Dio in the life of Commodus: so in the language of the Scriptures, and a religious notion, they signify an happy and a blessed life: as 1 Sam. x. 24. יחי המלך *Let the King live*, is translated by the Chaldee Paraphrast, יצלח מלכא *Let the King prosper.* And when David sent unto Nabal, he said, *Thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity*, which is in the original nothing but לחי; 1 Sam. xxv. 6. So the Psalmist is to be understood, Psal. lxix. 32. *The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seek God.* And St. Paul, 1 Thess. iii. 8. Ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκητε ἐν Κυρίῳ. Thus *life* of itself is often taken in the Scriptures for a happy and glorious life, even that which is eternal, as St. Austin observeth upon these words of the 119th Psalm, ver. 77. [vol. iv. p. 1327 A.] 'Veniant mihi miserationes tuæ et vivam: Tunc enim vere vivam, quando nihil potero timere ne moriar. Ipsa enim et sine ullo additamento dicitur *vita*, nec intelligitur nisi æterna et beata, tanquam sola dicenda sit vita, in cujus comparatione ista quam ducimus mors potius sit appellanda quam vita; quale illud est in Evangelio, *Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata.* Nunquid addidit, *æternam* vel *beatam?* Item de resurrectione carnis cum loqueretur, *Qui bene fecerunt*, inquit, *in resurrectionem vitæ;* neque hic ait, *æternæ* seu *beatæ.* Sic et hic, *Veniant*, inquit, *mihi miserationes* tuæ, *et vivam;* neque hic ait, *in æternum vivam*, vel, *beate vivam;* quasi aliud non sit vivere, quam sine ullo fine, et sine ulla miseria vivere.' Thus St. Austin. And again; 'Non est vera vita, nisi ubi feliciter vivitur; nec vera incorruptio, nisi ubi salus nullo dolore corrumpitur.' *Enchir. de Fide, &c. cap.* 92. [vol. vi. p. 230 F.]

able even to subdue all things unto himself. Thus when we come into that other world, the world of spirits, even our bodies shall be spiritual.

As for the better part of man, the soul, it shall be highly 390 exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts or faculties thereof. The understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. *Now we seë through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now* we *know* but *in part, but then shall* we *know even as also* we *are known.* And this even now *we know, that when* God *shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.* Our first temptation was, that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by Christ, we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefective holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin: they shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their radical and fundamental freedom shall fully embrace the greatest good[75]. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction: and all this shall be effected, that we may be thereby made capable, and then happy by a full fruition.

1 Cor. xiii. 12.

1 John iii. 2.

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God: this is the *life.*

And now the *duration* of this life is as necessary as the life itself, because to make all already mentioned amount unto a

75 'Sicut prima immortalitas fuit, quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit non posse mori; ita primum liberum arbitrium posse non peccare, novissimum non posse peccare. Sic enim erit inamissibilis voluntas pietatis et æquitatis, quomodo est felicitatis. Nam utique peccando nec pietatem nec felicitatem tenuimus, voluntatem vero felicitatis nec perdita felicitate perdidimus. Certe Deus ipse nunquid quoniam peccare non potest, ideo liberum arbitrium habere negandus est? Erit ergo illius civitatis et una in omnibus, et inseparabilis in singulis voluntas libera, ab omni malo liberata, et impleta omni bono, fruens indeficienter æternorum jucunditate gaudiorum, oblita culparum, oblita pœnarum, nec tamen ideo suæ liberationis oblita, ut liberatori suo non sit grata.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* xxii. *cap.* 30. [vol. vii. p. 701 A.] Vide eundem, *Tractatu de Epicuris et Stoicis,* [al. Serm. CL.] prope finem.

true felicity, there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it, or being deprived of it. And this is added to complete our happiness, by the adjection of eternity. Now that this life shall be eternal, we are assured who have not yet obtained it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchased it for us, and promised it unto us, often calleth it *eternal life;* it is described as a *continuing city,* as *everlasting habitations,* as an *house eternal in the heavens;* it is expressed by *eternal glory, eternal salvation,* by an *eternal inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;* by *the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* And lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, *If any man keep my saying, he shall never see death:* and, *Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not die.* When *God shall wipe away all tears from* our *eyes, there shall be no more death;* and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life: which is expressed by St. Paul by way of opposition, calling it *life and immortality,* and that together with the abolition of death, saying that *our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.*

Heb. xiii. 14. Luke xvi. 9. 2 Cor. v. 1. 1 Pet. v. 10. Heb. v. 9; ix. 15. 1 Pet. i. 4. 2 Pet. i. 11. John viii. 51; xi. 26. Rev. xxi. 4. 2 Tim. i. 10.

The belief of this Article is necessary, (as to the eternity of torment,) to deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life, and a speedy repentance for sin committed. For, *the wages of sin is death;* nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm, 397 who dieth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but because he sinned and repented not. They which imagine the pains inflicted for sin to be either small or short, have but a slender motive to innocence or repentance[76]; but

Rom. vi. 23.

76 Tertullian recounting the advantages of the Christians towards innocence and holiness of life, which the heathens had not; 'Recogitate etiam pro brevitate supplicii cujuslibet, non tamen ultra mortem remansuri. Sic et Epicurus omnem cruciatum doloremque depretiat, modicum quidem contemptibilem pronunciando, magnum vero non diuturnum. Enimvero nos qui sub Deo omnium speculatore dispungimur, quique æternam ab eo pœnam providemus, merito soli innocentiæ occurrimus, et pro scientiæ plenitudine, et pro latebrarum difficultate, et pro magnitudine cruciatus, non diuturni, verum sempiterni, eum timentes, quem timere debebit et ipse qui timentes judicat, Deum, non Proconsulem, timentes.' *Apolog. cap.* 45. [p. 35 B.]

such as firmly believe them sharp and endless, have by virtue of that faith within themselves a proper and natural spur
Isa. xxxiii. 14. and incitement to avoid them: for *who* can *dwell in everlasting burnings?*

Secondly, The belief of eternal pains after death is necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his justice, and the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that direction, to
Luke xii. 5. embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, *I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* And that exclusively of such fear as concerns the greatest pains of this life, which the martyrs undervalued out of a belief of eternal torments[77].

Thirdly, This belief is necessary to teach us to make a fit estimate of the price of Christ's blood, to value sufficiently the work of our redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ. For he which believeth not the eternity of torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankful to his Redeemer, by whose intervention we have escaped them. Whereas he who is sensible of the loss of heaven, and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the Devil and his angels, the vials of the wrath of an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value the price of
Ps. cxxx. 7. that blood, and be proportionately thankful for so *plenteous a redemption.*

Again, As this Article followeth upon the resurrection of the just, and containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of the kingdom of heaven, and that righteousness to
Exod. iii. 3. which such a life is promised. *I will now turn aside and see this great sight,* said Moses, when he saw the burning bush:

77 So Polycarpus the Martyr answered the Proconsul threatening to consume him with fire; Πῦρ ἀπειλεῖς τὸ πρὸς ὥραν καιόμενον, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον σβεννύμενον. Ἀγνοεῖς γὰρ τὸ τῆς μελλούσης κρίσεως καὶ αἰωνίου κολάσεως τοῖς ἀσεβέσι τηρούμενον πῦρ. *Epist. Smyrn. Eccles. cap.* 11. [p. 199.]

It is good for us to be here, said St. Peter, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the mount; how much more ought we to be inflamed with a desire of the joys of heaven, and that length of days which only satisfieth by its eternity[78], to a careful and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised! For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him. Matt. xvii. 4.

398 Secondly, This belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a contempt of the world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven[79]: *to set* our *affections on things above, not on things on the earth,* considering we *are dead, and* our *life is hid with Christ in God.* For *where* our *treasure is, there will* our *hearts be also.* Therefore we must *forget those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.* Col. iii. 2, 3. Matt. vi. 21. Phil. iii. 13, 14.

Thirdly, An assent unto this truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the cross of Christ, and to support us under it, willingly and cheerfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, *reckoning* with the Apostle, *that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us;* and knowing that *our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.* And this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except *we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.* Rom. viii. 18. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

78 So St. Austin upon those words, *Longitudine dierum replebo eum,* in the 90th Psalm; 'Quæ est longitudo dierum? Vita æterna. Fratres, nolite putare longitudinem dierum dici, sicut sunt hyeme dies minores, æstate dies majores. Tales dies nobis habet dare? Longitudo illa est quæ non habet finem, æterna vita quæ nobis promittitur in diebus longis. Et vere, quia sufficit, non sine causa dixit, *replebo eum.* Non nobis sufficit quidquid longum est in tempore, si habet finem; et ideo nec longum dicendum est. Et si avari sumus, vitæ æternæ debemus esse avari: talem vitam desiderate, quæ non habet finem. Ecce ubi extendatur avaritia nostra. Argentum vis sine fine? Vitam æternam desidera sine fine. Non vis ut habeat finem possessio tua? Vitam æternam quære.' [§. 12. vol. iv. p. 979 F.]

79 'Nemo vitam æternam, incorruptibilem, immortalemque desiderat, nisi eum vitæ hujus temporalis, corruptibilis mortalisque pœniteat.' *S. August. Homil.* 50. [Serm. CCCLI. 3. vol. v. p. 1352 D.]

And now having thus shewed the propriety, proved the verity, and declared the necessity of this Article, we may fully instruct every Christian how to express his belief in the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce: I do fully and freely assent unto this, as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust after their resurrection and condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall so be continued in torments for ever, so as neither the justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them: and that the just after their resurrection and absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their Master's joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin, and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe *the life everlasting.*

THE END.

INDEX

OF

THE TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE THAT ARE MENTIONED, AND MORE OR LESS EXPLAINED, IN THIS WORK.

GENESIS.

i. 1 ..... pag. 99
i. 2, 9, 11, 20 99
i. 3 208
i. 4 103
i. 21, 27 94
i. 26 ..... 206, 208
i. 27 ..... 208 note
i. 28 ..... 58, 244, 295
i. 31 ..... 100, 114
ii. 1 ..... 75, 111
ii. 3 ..... 93 n.
ii. 4 46
ii. 7 ..... 94 and n.
ii. 7, 19 99
iii. 8 ..... 208 n.
iii. 15 ..... 284, 306, 358
iii. 19 99
iii. 22 208
iv. 7 ..... 524, 638
iv. 26 ..... 201 n.
v. 3 ..... 52, 58, 244
vi. 6 120
vii. 2 608
vii. 11 ..... 111 n.
viii. 7 ..... 311 n.
xii. 5 314
xiii. 8 314
xiii. 15 262
xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22 ... 30
xiv. 19, 20 171
xv. 2, 8 ..... 260 n.
xv. 6 ..... 27 n.
xvii. 1 515
xviii. 1, 2 627
xviii. 12 ..... 259 n.
xviii. 14 248
xviii. 25 522
xx. 6 ..... 640 n.
xxi. 12 ..... 145, 248
xxii. 2 358
xxii. 6 ..... 358 n.
xxii. 7 358
xxii. 18 ..... 147, 284
xxiv. 18 ..... 259 n.

GENESIS.

xxiv. 67 ..... p. 155 n.
xxvi. 3 262
xxviii. 15 311
xxviii. 18 144
xxix. 12 314
xxix. 17 ..... 156 n.
xxx. 1, 2 48
xxxi. 35 ..... 259 n.
xxxiii. 8 ..... 259 n.
xxxv. 18 ..... 640 n.
xxxvii. 35 .. 416 and n.
xxxviii. 17, 18, 20 .. 584 n.
xxxix. 2 ..... 259 n.
xxxix. 6 ..... 156 n.
xl. 9 ..... 481 n.
xli. 40, 42, 43 490
xlii. 10 ..... 259 n.
xlii. 33 ..... 640 n.
xlii. 38 .. .. 416 and n.
xliv. 5 ..... 259 n.
xliv. 18 ..... 481 n.
xlv. 2 ..... 640 n.
xlix. 8 148
xlix. 10 ..... 147, 520
l. 17 ..... 641 n.

EXODUS.

i. 17 ..... 460 n.
i. 18, 22 ..... 460 n.
iii. 2 12
iii. 3 696
iii. 6 677
iii. 14 .. 222, 262 n., 263 n.
iii. 15 ..... 261 n.
iv. 1 13
iv. 16, 30, 31 13
iv. 22 47
vi. 3, 4 .. 260 and n., 666
vi. 4 ..... 667 n.
xii. 2 473
xii. 5 322
xii. 46 359
xiii. 2 ..... 312, 313
xiv. 31 ..... 13, 27 n.
xv. 1 ..... 664 n.

EXODUS.

xv. 3 ..... p. 265 n.
xv. 18 79
xv. 20 ..... 303 n.
xvi. 5 471
xvii. 15 .... 232, 266 n.
xix. 9 ..... 28 n.
xix. 22 170
xx. 3 43
xx. 11 86
xxi. 2, 4 ..... 259 n.
xxi. 6 218
xxii. 31 623
xxiv. 5 170
xxiv. 13 ..... 136, 137
xxviii. 38 ..... 622 n.
xxix. 7 ..... 143 n.
xxxi. 13 475
xxxi. 17 86
xxxiv. 33 ..... 396 n.
xxxiv. 34 .. 560, 561 n.
xxxv. 15 ..... 143 n.
xl. 7 ..... 143 n.
xl. 15 ..... 166 n.

LEVITICUS.

iv. 3 144
iv. 3, 5, 16 .... 166 n.
iv. 20 ..... 641 n.
v. 15 ..... 622 n.
vi. 22 ..... 166 n.
vi. 30 133
viii. 12 179
viii. 35 ..... 496 n.
x. 4 314
xi. 44 52
xvi. 2 480
xvi. 8 331
xix. 2 ..... 52, 623
xix. 28 415
xx. 7 52
xxi. 1 415
xxi. 8 623
xxi. 10, 12 ..... 143 n.
xxi. 11 ..... 414 n.
xxii. 2 ..... 622 n.

LEVITICUS.

xxii. 4 .... p. 414 n., 415
xxiii. 10, 11, 12 463
xxv. 42 278
xxv. 48, 49 .... 133, 541

NUMBERS.

iii. 3 .... 143 n.
iv. 47 168
v. 2 .... 414 n., 415
vi. 6 .... 414 n., 415
xiii. 16 .... 124, 125 n.
xiv. 19 .... 641 n.
xvi. 30 94
xviii. 16 313
xix. 11, 13 .... 414 n.
xxi. 9 358
xxii. 28 14
xxii. 35 14
xxiii. 5 14
xxiii. 19 8
xxiv. 9 .... 361 n.

DEUTERONOMY.

iv. 35 .... 40, 42
v. 15 472
v. 27 277
vi. 4 .... 255, 265, 268 n.
vi. 4, 5 44
vi. 11 .... 397 n.
viii. 5 51
x. 14 77
x. 17 .... 30, 77
x. 20 255
xv. 1, 2 .... 640 n.
xv. 17 218
xviii. 18 .... 146, 152
xxi. 11 .... 156 n.
xxi. 22, 23 .... 372 n., 392
xxi. 23 372
xxiv. 15 .... 75 n.
xxvii. 25 373
xxvii. 26 371
xxxii. 4 9
xxxii. 6 47
xxxii. 39 42
xxxiii. 2 .... 622 n.
xxxiii. 3 .... 625 and n.
xxxiii. 6 .... 689 n.
xxxiii. 29 .... 564 n.
xxxiv. 6 312

JOSHUA.

i. 1 137
iii. 11, 13 77
v. 2 137
x. 12, 13 138
x. 24 499
xviii. 1 .... 593 n.

JUDGES.

iii. 9, 15 130
v. 17 .... 496 n.
v. 20 120
vi. 24 .... 232, 266 n.

JUDGES.

viii. 18 .... p. 156 n.
viii. 19 .... 460 n.
ix. 9 178

RUTH.

i. 20, 21 .... 81 n.
ii. 14 .... 155 n.
iii. 3 .... 177 n.
iii. 15 .... 396 n.

1 SAMUEL.

ii. 3 8
ii. 6 416
iii. 7, 21 12
ix. 15 12
x. 24 .... 693 n.
xiv. 15 .... 341 n.
xv. 1 165
xv. 29 8
xv. 35 312
xvi. 12 166
xvi. 13 .... 176, 499
xvi. 14 548
xvii. 32 .... 259 n.
xvii. 47 .... 126 n.
xviii. 18 633
xxv. 6 .... 693 n.
xxvii. 9 .... 460 n.
xxvii. 13 .... 28 n.
xxix. 4 .... 133, 643

2 SAMUEL.

ii. 4 .... 176, 499
v. 1, 3 176
vi. 23 .... 311 n., 312
vii. 16 .... 273, 498
xvi. 10 80
xviii. 10 .... 373 n.
xxii. 6 .... 436 n.
xxii. 16 .... 640 n.
xxiii. 2 14

1 KINGS.

i. 39 .... 177 n.
i. 39, 40 174
ii. 19 493
v. 15 .... 397 n.
viii. 53 14
xiv. 18 14
xvii. 4, 6 120
xvii. 22 668
xix. 15, 16 166
xx. 31 .... 460 n.

2 KINGS.

ii. 1, 2 488
ii. 9, 10 .... 226 n.
iv. 668
iv. 16 .... 564 n.
xiii. 21 668
xvi. 2 308
xvii. 1 124
xvii. 14 .... 27 n.
xviii. 2 308

1 CHRONICLES.

iii. 1, 2, 3, &c. .. p. 247 n.
iii. 24 .... 518 n.
vii. 27 .... 124 n.
xxiii. 13 171
xxiv. 5 .... 622 n.
xxiv. 11 .... 124 n.
xxvii. 20 124
xxix. 11, 12, 14 78

2 CHRONICLES.

vi. 30 44
xviii. 20, 21 548
xx. 6 510
xx. 20 .... 28 n.
xxxi. 15 .... 124 n.

EZRA.

iii. 12 149

NEHEMIAH.

viii. 8 146
ix. 5, 6 118
ix. 6 83
ix. 27 135
x. 29 .... 260 n., 373

JOB.

i. 21 408
v. 1 .... 622 n.
v. 14 .... 219 n.
viii. 3 .... 81 n.
x. 3 121
x. 10 .... 219 n.
xi. 12 .... 219 n.
xiii. 12 .... 219 n.
xiii. 28 .... 219 n.
xiv. 4 298
xv. 16 .... 219 n.
xvii. 14, 16 655
xix. 23, 24 665
xix. 25, 26 664
xix. 26, 27 671
xxi. 15 .... 81 n.
xxii. 3 .... 81 n.
xxiv. 20 .... 219 n.
xxvi. 7 88
xxvi. 13 557
xxvii. 16 .... 219 n.
xxviii. 2 .... 219 n.
xxviii. 26 90
xxix. 14 .... 219 n.
xxx. 19 .... 219 n.
xxxi. 2 .... 81 n.
xxxviii. 7, 4 89
xxxviii. 7 46
xxxviii. 28 46
xl. 15 .... 219 n.
xlii. 1, 2 510

PSALMS.

ii. 2 451
ii. 6, 7 451
ii. 6 172
ii. 7 .... 243, 306 n., 462
ii. 8 .... 160, 274, 615

PSALMS.

v. 2 ..... p. 233 n.
vii. 8 ..... 480 n.
viii. 3, 4 119
xvi. 2 79
xvi. 2, 3 625
xvi. 9, 10 .... 390, 414
xvi. 10 .... 414 n., 452
xvi. 11 494
xviii. 2 8
xviii. 4, 5 ..... 436 n.
xviii. 31 42
xviii. 36 ..... 492 n.
xix. 1 118
xxi. ..... 264 n., 265 n.
xxi. 7 .... 519 n., 520 n.
xxii. 1, 7, 8, 16 158
xxii. 14 342
xxii. 16 .. 158, 361 and n.
xxii. 18 159
xxiv. 1, 2 121
xxv. 18 ..... 641 n.
xxvii. 13 ..... 377 n.
xxxi. 22 ..... 340 n.
xxxii. 1, 2 ... 641 n., 651
xxxiii. 6 208
xxxv. 23 ..... 234 n.
xxxix. 9 80
xl. 6 218
xlii. 5 .... 233 n., 340 n.
xliv. 1 38
xlv. 7 .... 174, 175, 588
xlviii. 5 ..... 341 n.
xlviii. 8 605
xlix. 3 ..... 233 n.
li. 10 94
lviii. 11 522
lxii. 1 ..... 233 n.
lxii. 2 43
lxiii. 9 .... 407 n., 408
lxvi. 3 ..... 564 n.
lxviii. 18 480
lxix. 21 159
lxix. 32 ..... 693 n.
lxx. 12 ..... 233 n.
lxxi. 19 ..... 480 n.
lxxii. 11 160
lxxii. 18 38
lxxiii. 2 539
lxxvi. 1, 2 615
lxxviii. 3 ..... 33 n.
lxxviii. 32 ..... 28 n.
lxxviii. 36, 41 ... 564 n.
lxxxi. 15 ..... 564 n.
lxxxii. 5, 6 224
lxxxiii. 18 .. 260, 261 n.
lxxxiv. 3 ..... 234 n.
lxxxix. 5, 7, 8 .. 625 and n.
lxxxix. 11 78
lxxxix. 20 176
xc. 2 ..... 197 n.
xc. 2, 4 ..... 112 n.
xciii. 3 ..... 665 n.

PSALMS.

xciii. 4 ..... p. 480 n.
xciv. 9, 10 102
xcvii. 5 ..... 77, 255
xcvii. 9 ..... 236 n.
ciii. 13 51
civ. 3 89
civ. 4 89
civ. 24, 31 118
civ. 31 80
cvi. 16 625
cx. 1 .. 159, 269, 272, 490 492 n., 496, 502
cx. 2 272
cx. 4 .... 167, 170, 491
cx. 7 .. 271, 344, 388, 457
cxv. 15 ..... 94 n.
cxvi. 3 ..... 340 n.
cxvi. 6 ..... 126 n.
cxvi. 10 21
cxix. 66 ..... 28 n.
cxix. 73 120
cxix. 77 ..... 693 n.
cxxi. 2 ..... 94 n.
cxxi. 2, 3 121
cxxix. 3 339
cxxx. 7 696
cxxxii. 11, 12 498
cxxxiii. 2 185
cxxxvi. 2 30
cxxxvi. 3 76
cxxxix. 15 .. 407 n., 408
cxxxix. 15, 16 .. 407 n., 657
cxlv. 10, 11 119
cxlv. 13 79
cxlvi. 5, 6 121
cxlvii. 5 8
cxlvii. 19, 20 615
cxlviii. 2, 3, 4, 5 ... 118
cxlviii. 8 120
cxlviii. 13 118

PROVERBS.

viii. 22, 23 104
viii. 23 ..... 207 n., 214
viii. 25 ..... 197 n.
viii. 30 ..... 208 n.
viii. 34 182
xiv. 12 ..... 436 n.
xvi. 4 ..... 79, 118
xvi. 25 ..... 436 n.
xx. 8 497
xxx. 4 ..... 82, 242

ECCLESIASTES.

iii. 21 672
vii. 16 ..... 341 n.
xii. 1 ..... 94 n.
xii. 14 ..... 526, 532

CANTICLES.

ii. 7 140
iii. 5 140
iv. 5 .... 150 n., 328 n.
vii. 3 ..... 328 n.

CANTICLES.

viii. 1 ..... p. 322 n.
viii. 4 140

ISAIAH.

i. 2 ..... 86, 121
i. 9 ..... 75 n.
i. 24 ..... 260 n.
ii. 2 160
ii. 3, 4 181
vi. 1, 3 222
vi. 3 ..... 75 n.
vii. 14 .... 152, 307, 317
viii. 8 152
viii. 13, 14 264
viii. 18 53
ix. 2, 6, 3 139
ix. 6 .. 172, 232, 329, 554
ix. 7 172
xi. 1, 10 151
xi. 6 181
xi. 10 ..... 147, 160
xiii. 6 ..... 81 n.
xiv. 27 509
xvi. 1 182
xvi. 5 497
xvii. 7 ..... 94 n.
xxii. 14. 12, 641 n., 689 n.
xxii. 16 ..... 397 n.
xxiv. 18 ..... 328 n.
xxviii. 4 ..... 487 n.
xxviii. 16 600
xxxiii. 14 696
xxxv. 4, 10 139
xxxviii. 11 ..... 377 n.
xxxviii. 13 ..... 361 n.
xl. 3 267
xl. 12 83
xl. 25 220
xl. 26 120
xl. 28 121
xli. 4 221
xli. 16 ..... 622 n.
xlii. 1, 4 153
xlii. 5 ..... 94 n.
xlii. 5, 6 116
xliii. 1, 7 ..... 94 n.
xliv. 6 ..... 41, 221
xliv. 8 43
xliv. 24 47
xlv. 2 ..... 428 n.
xlv. 5, 6, 18, 21, 22 ... 42
xlv. 7 ..... 94, 116
xlv. 7, 5 116
xlv. 9 80
xlv. 12 .. 75, 94 n., 208 n.
xlv. 18 ..... 43, 94 n.
xlv. 21, 22 43
xlvi. 3 47
xlvi. 5 220
xlviii. 12 ..... 41, 221
xlviii. 13 .... 120, 208 n.
xlviii. 16 558
xlix. 23 162

ISAIAH.

li. 1 ..... p. 397 n.
lii. 13 155
lii. 14, 15 ..... 327 n.
liii. 2, 3 ..... 156, 217
liii. 3 ... 158, 327 n., 340
liii. 3, 4, 5, 8 ... 327 n.
liii. 4 ..... 155 n.
liii. 4, 5, 6 642
liii. 5 158
liii. 6 ..... 139, 342
liii. 7, 8, 9 159
liii. 7, 8, 10 377
liii. 8, 9 390
liii. 9 ... 159, 392, 398
liii. 10 ..... 332, 386
liii. 12 159
liv. 16, 17 121
lv. 3 452
lvii. 11 ..... 564 n.
lx. 3 162
lxi. 1 168
lxiii. 3 139
lxiii. 16 47
lxv. 6 ..... 689 n.
lxv. 17 94
lxvi. 1 ..... 86, 484
lxvi. 14 680

JEREMIAH.

i. 5 168
x. 10 61
x. 12 118
xviii. 6 78
xxiii. 5, 6 ... 265 n., 266
xxiii. 24 86
xxvii. 5 .... 119, 208 n.
xxx. 9 498
xxx. 21 ..... 520 n.
xxxi. 22 306
xxxii. 23 95
xxxiii. 15, 16 ... 265 n.
xxxiii. 16 232
li. 5 ..... 622 n.
li. 15 117

LAMENTATIONS.

i. 6 264
i. 12 343
i. 16 ..... 265 n.

EZEKIEL.

i. 24 ..... 81 n., 209 n.
xxxiv. 23, 24 .. 273, 498
xxxvii. 1, 7, 8, 10 .. 655
xxxvii. 24, 25 498
xliv. 2 310
xlviii. 35 232

DANIEL.

ii. 47 30
iii. 9 387
iv. 35 ..... 41, 509
v. 23 77
vii. 7 ..... 341 n.
vii. 10 532

DANIEL.

vii. 13.. p. 518 n, 520 n.
vii. 13, 14 .... 273. 518
vii. 18, 21, 22, 25 .. 625 n.
vii. 25 625
viii. 13 ..... 622 n.
viii. 14 ..... 467 n., 468
viii. 17 ..... p. 341 n.
viii. 26 ..... 467 n.
ix. 26 146
xi. 36 30
xii. 2 ..... 665 and n., 673, 677
xii. 7 79

HOSEA.

i. 1. 123
i. 7 ..... 265 and n.
iii. 5 498
vi. 2 159
xi. 1 159
xiii. 14 ..... 502, 681

JOEL.

i. 20 ..... 640 n.
ii. 32 267

AMOS.

iv. 13 90

JONAH.

i. 17 462
ii. 1 ..... 469 n.
ii. 10 ..... 120, 462

MICAH.

ii. 13 .. 478, 481 and n.
iv. 1 147
iv. 4 496
iv. 5 79
iv. 13 77
vi. 4 303

HAGGAI.

ii. 3 149
ii. 6, 7, 9 148
ii. 13 ..... 414 n.

ZECHARIAH.

ii. 10, 11 267
iv. 7 .... 155 n., 360 n.
iv. 14 77
vi. 5 77
ix. 9 .. 328 n., 329, 519
x. 12 265
xi. 12 158
xii. 10.. 158, 328 n., 360 and n., 361 n., 581
xiii. 2 ..... 163, 181
xiv. 5 ..... 622 n.

MALACHI.

i. 6 50
i. 11 160
ii. 10 47
ii. 13 ..... 261 n.
iii. 1 ... 148, 267, 328 n.
iv. 2 138
iv. 5 168

ST. MATTHEW.

i. 1 .. p. 126 n., 151, 286
i. 16. ..... 123, 294
i. 17 ..... 111 n.
i. 18 .. 294, 295, 303 n., 309, 318
i. 20 ... 188, 233 n., 295, 303 n.
i. 21. ..... 127, 135, 648
i. 22 ..... 152, 268 n.
i. 22, 23 ... 128, 231, 309
i. 25 311
ii. 1 ..... 188 n.
ii. 4, 5 ..... 151, 323
ii. 4, 5, 6. ..... 151, 323
iii. 3 268
iii. 4 ..... 33 n.
iii. 7 540
iii. 12 .... 530, 608, 687
iii. 15 ..... 640 n.
iii. 16 .... 177, 179, 568
iii. 17.. 54, 139, 178, 462
iv. 5 609
iv. 10 .... 43, 255 and n.
v. 18 .... 311 n., 365 n.
v. 22 638
v. 23, 24 643
v. 24 ..... 640 n.
v. 44, 45 52
vi. 8 50
vi. 12 ..... 640 n.
vi. 13 517
vi. 21 ..... 488, 697
vi. 24 44
vii. 4 ..... 640 n.
vii. 4, 16, 20 ..... 33 n.
vii. 9, 10, 11 51
vii. 24, 25 605
vii. 29 153
viii. 11 .... 441, 442 n.
viii. 15 ..... 640 n.
viii. 20 158
viii. 22 478
viii. 27 140
ix. 2, 6 271
ix. 27 323
ix. 38 ..... 259 n.
x. 8 154
x. 16, 25 ..... 289 n.
x. 20 571
x. 24 ..... 259 n.
x. 28 .... 379, 421, 674, 686 and n.
x. 29, 30 657
x. 32 21
x. 37 139
x. 40 564
xi. 2, 3, 4, 5 153
xi. 3 329
xi. 10 267
xi. 19 ..... 33 n.
xi. 25 77
xii. 6, 8 271

ST. MATTHEW.

xii. 23 ..... p. 151, 323
xii. 28 ..... 215 n.
xii. 31, 32 556
xii. 34 20
xii. 40 ... 389, 462, 465
xii. 46 313
xii. 50 50
xiii. 24, 30, 47 608
xiii. 27 ..... 259 n.
xiii. 30, 39, 47, 48 .. 530
xiii. 35 ..... 33 n.
xiii. 39 679
xiii. 52 ..... 183 n.
xiii. 55 ... 158, 302, 315
xiii. 56 ..... 208 n.
xiv. 34, 36 154
xv. 22 323
xv. 24 160
xvi. 16 ..... 233 n., 246
xvi. 18 ..... 229 n., 594, 598, 604
xvi. 21 ..... 33 n., 463
xvi. 27 .. 271, 521, 529
xvi. 28 .... 173, 500, 520
xvii. 4 697
xvii. 5 ..... 54, 182
xvii. 18 ..... 33 n.
xvii. 23 466
xviii. 8 687
xviii. 10 628
xviii. 17 618
xviii. 20 605
xviii. 25, &c. ..... 259 n.
xviii. 27, 32 ..... 640 n.
xix. 17 100
xix. 27 ..... 640 n.
xix. 28 ..... 48, 531
xx. 8 ..... 259 n.
xx. 19 466
xx. 28 .... 133, 385, 644
xx. 30, 31 ... 233 n., 323
xx. 31 151
xxi. 4, 5 172
xxi. 9 151
xxi. 15 323
xxi. 30 ..... 259 n.
xxi. 31 138
xxi. 33, &c. 63
xxii. 10 ..... 608 n.
xxii. 11, 14 608
xxii. 29 667
xxii. 31, 32 .... 666, 669
xxii. 42 .. 151, 323, 491
xxiii. 23 ..... 640 n.
xxiv. 3 ..... 520 n.
xxiv. 31 531
xxiv. 34 ..... 311 n.
xxv. 10 530
xxv. 11 619
xxv. 19, 21, 30, 31, 32, 33 530
xxv. 31, 32 .. 622 n., 678

ST. MATTHEW.

xxv. 32 ..... p. 531
xxv. 34 ... 183, 532, 692
xxv. 43, 41 678
xxv. 41, 46 .... 437, 532, 686, 687 n.
xxvi. 2 361
xxvi. 15 158
xxvi. 28 .. 133, 385, 642
xxvi. 29 ..... 311 n.
xxvi. 37 340
xxvi. 38 ..... 286, 340
xxvi. 56 ..... 640 n.
xxvi. 63 187
xxvi. 64 .. 494, 521, 528
xxvi. 66 ..... 639 n.
xxvii. 393
xxvii. 1 .... 393, 397 n.
xxvii. 18, 19 351
xxvii. 22 528
xxvii. 26 362
xxvii. 31 362
xxvii. 39, 43 158
xxvii. 42 376
xxvii. 46 ..... 158, 384
xxvii. 48 159
xxvii. 50 ..... 640 n.
xxvii. 52, 53 625 and n., 675
xxvii. 53 609
xxvii. 54 392
xxvii. 56 ..... 302, 316
xxvii. 57 ..... 183 n.
xxvii. 59 ..... 394 n.
xxvii. 60 .. 396, 397 n.
xxvii. 62 470
xxvii. 63 .... 259 n., 465
xxviii. 1 .. 303 n., 316, 472
xxviii. 2, 3, 4, 11 ... 454
xxviii. 6 258
xxviii. 8, 9 453
xxviii. 14 ..... 345 n.
xxviii. 18 .... 271, 497
xxviii. 18, 19 55
xxviii. 18, 20 182
xxviii. 19 .. 161, 546, 569, 570, 586, 602, 615
xxviii. 19, 20 605
xxviii. 20 ..... 232, 312

ST. MARK.

i. 4 649
i. 11 248
i. 13 193
i. 15 ..... 28 n.
ii. 26 ..... 345 n.
iii. 28, 29 639
v. 25, 29 154
v. 41, 42 668
vi. 3 158
viii. 31 465
viii. 38 ..... 622 n.
ix. 12 ..... 326, 327

ST. MARK.

ix. 17, 23, 24 .... p. 24
ix. 31 466
ix. 38 140
ix. 43, 44, 45, 46 .. 687
ix. 44 437
x. 6 ..... 33 n.
x. 27 508
x. 34 466
xii. 35 151
xii. 36 ..... 268 n.
xiii. 9 ..... 345 n.
xiii. 19 ..... 33 n.
xiii. 35 ..... 259 n.
xiv. 3, 8 394
xiv. 33 340
xiv. 36 ..... 233 n.
xiv. 49 ..... 208 n.
xiv. 58 465
xiv. 61 ..... 236 n.
xiv. 62 494
xiv. 64 350
xv. 393
xv. 1 350
xv. 15 352
xv. 27 159
xv. 34 ..... 233 n.
xv. 37, 39 .. 382, 640 n.
xv. 40 ..... 303 n., 316
xv. 42 ..... 469 n., 471
xv. 44 381
xv. 44, 45 398
xv. 46 .. 394 n., 396 and n.
xvi. 1 ..... 316, 394
xvi. 1, 2 472
xvi. 3 ..... 397 n.
xvi. 15 615
xvi. 17 154
xvi. 19 492
xvi. 19, 20 258

ST. LUKE.

i. 8, 19, 21, 22 171
i. 13, 57 ..... 188 n.
i. 15 ..... 168, 194
i. 17 168
i. 23 ..... 468 n.
i. 26, 27 .. 301, 303 n., 308
i. 30 ..... 303 n.
i. 31 ..... 127, 293, 317
i. 32 323
i. 32, 33 .. 172, 273, 498
i. 34 293
i. 35 .. 57, 168, 175, 179, 189, 295, 558, 569 n.
i. 36, 5 304
i. 37 ..... 295, 508, 657
i. 42 ..... 317, 321
i. 43 318
i. 48 321
i. 57 318
i. 69 ..... 135, 323
i. 69, 71 138

ST. LUKE.

i. 70 ..... p. 14, 579
i. 76, 77 ..... 268, 647
i. 78 300
ii. 4 323
ii. 4, 11 152
ii. 5, 6, 7 .. 303 n., 318
ii. 10, 11 139
ii. 11 128
ii. 21 .. 123, 468, 468 n.
ii. 22, 23 .... 268 n., 311
ii. 27, 33, 48 294
ii. 30 135
ii. 46 467
ii. 48 192
ii. 51 ..... 158, 192
ii. 52 286
iii. 1 ..... 348 n., 352
iii. 2 ..... 345 n.
iii. 15 145
iii. 17 687
iii. 22, 23 .... 168, 294
iii. 38 ..... 47, 190
iv. 14 ..... 176, 193
iv. 18 588
iv. 21, 22 ..... 168, 176
vi. 17, 19 154
vi. 36 52
vi. 46 80
vii. 12, 14, 15 668
vi. 41, 42 652
viii. 2 303
viii. 55 668
ix. 22 465
ix. 26 ..... 22, 622 n.
ix. 49 140
ix. 51 ..... 226 n.
x. 16 564
x. 19 154
x. 21 117
x. 39, 42 182
xi. 2 50
xi. 13 587
xi. 27 318
xi. 42 ..... 640 n.
xii. 5 ..... 76, 515, 696
xii. 42 258
xiii. 1 352
xiii. 28 441
xiv. 14 678
xiv. 26 140
xv. 10 628
xvi. 9 695
xvi. 13 ..... 259 n.
xvi. 16 136
xvi. 23 ..... 441, 442 n.
xvi. 29, 31 ... 136 n., 435
xvii. 3 ..... 640 n.
xvii. 25 ..... 33 n.
xvii. 33 ..... 460 n.
xviii. 31 333
xviii. 33 465
xix. 27 173

ST. LUKE.

xx. 35, 36 p. 48, 189, 477
xx. 42 ..... 491 n.
xxii. 20 385
xxii. 22 331
xxii. 42 286
xxii. 44 342
xxii. 69 ..... 493, 494
xxiii. 393
xxiii. 2 368
xxiii. 14, 22 351
xxiii. 24 362
xxiii. 31 344
xxiii. 34 386
xxiii. 39 ..... 372 n.
xxiii. 46 .. 286, 380, 385
xxiii. 53 ..... 394 n.
xxiii. 54 .... 469 n., 471
xxiv. 1 ..... 394, 472
xxiv. 5, 6 ..... 454, 478
xxiv. 7, 46 466
xxiv. 12 ..... 394 n.
xxiv. 25, 26 333
xxiv. 26 344
xxiv. 26, 46 326
xxiv. 27 ..... 136 n.
xxiv. 34 258
xxiv. 37, 39 456
xxiv. 39 ..... 285, 676
xxiv. 41, 43, 44 ... 456
xxiv. 46 159
xxiv. 47 ... 615, 647, 652
xxiv. 49 161
xxiv. 50 172
xxiv. 50, 51 482

ST. JOHN.

i. 1 57
i 1, 2, 3 207
i. 1, 3 270
i. 3 557
i. 3, 10 87
i. 4, 5 216
i. 9 138
i. 12 ..... 53, 74, 95
i. 13 ..... 297, 300
i. 14 .. 17, 217, 232, 335
i. 14, 16 179
i. 15 195
i. 16 627
i. 17 137
i. 18 ..... 15, 132, 169
i. 12, 20, 21 145
i. 27 195
i. 29 322
i. 31 210
i. 34 168
i. 41 142
i. 45 294
i. 49, 50 ..... 57, 187
i. 12 313
ii. 19 ..... 465, 676
ii. 19, 21 458

ST. JOHN.

ii. 22 ..... p. 18, 458
iii. 1, 10 393
iii. 2 ..... 153, 169
iii. 3 47
iii. 5 ..... 215 n., 580
iii. 5, 6 ..... 215 n.
iii. 6 587
iii. 13 .. 192 n., 408, 457, 482
iii. 14 358
iii. 16 .... 140, 256, 554, 578, 643
iii. 16, 17, 18 .... 251 n.
iii. 17 132
iii. 26 168
iii. 31 ..... 194, 236 n.
iv. 1 258
iv. 11 ..... 259 n.
iv. 25 ..... 142, 145
v. 7 ..... 259 n.
v. 18 54
v. 18, 19, 26 239
v. 19 ..... 60, 117
v. 21 460
v. 22, 23 255
v. 22, 25, 27 ... 526, 527
v. 24 ..... 542, 692
v. 26 .. 59, 61, 154, 239
v. 27 271
v. 28 ..... 673, 678, 680
v. 29 677
v. 30 60
v. 33 169
v. 36 169
v. 45, 46 ..... 136 n.
v. 46, 47 17
vi. 23 258
vi. 24 ..... 197 n.
vi. 32, 33, 38, 51 ... 194
vi. 38 277
vi. 39 679
vi. 57 ..... 59, 62, 63
vi. 62 ..... 192, 485
vi. 69 ..... 24, 187
vii. 27, 31, 40, 41 ... 145
vii. 29 ..... 59, 63, 240
vii. 31 153
vii. 33, 34 ..... 197 n.
vii. 38 588
vii. 39 546
vii. 41, 42 151
viii. 12 ..... 197 n., 224
viii. 21 ..... 197 n.
viii. 23 408
viii. 51 695
viii. 58, &c. 196
ix. 22 142
ix. 35, 38 24
ix. 36, 38 ..... 259 n.
x. 17 385
x. 17, 18 461
x. 18 381

ST. JOHN.

x. 29 ..... p. 516
x. 30 241
x. 34, 35, 36 189
x. 35, 36 57
x. 37, 38 169
x. 38 242
x. 41 169
xi. 1 302
xi. 2 258
xi. 24 679
xi. 25 ..... 461, 666
xi. 26 695
xi. 27 187
xi. 39, 43, 44 668
xi. 42 154
xi. 44 394 and n., 395 n.
xii. 20 161
xii. 21 ..... 259 n.
xii. 26 ..... 197 n.
xii. 31 ..... 75 n.
xii. 32 488
xii. 36—41 ..... 222, 223
xiii. 3 271
xiii. 13 ..... 233 n.
xiii. 23 ..... 442 n.
xiii. 35 602
xiv. 1 122
xiv. 2 486
xiv. 3 ..... 197 n.
xiv. 3, 28 520
xiv. 8 633
xiv. 9 ..... 196 n.
xiv. 12 154
xiv. 15 140
xiv. 16 581
xiv. 23 627
xiv. 26 ..... 15, 549, 552, 568, 569, 571, 579
xiv. 28 ..... 59, 64, 240
xiv. 30 ..... 75 n.
xiv. 31 386
xv. 13 ..... 140, 386
xv. 15 18
xv. 26, 27 ..... 454, 549, 551, 568, 569, 571, 574 n.
xv. 27 ..... 196 n.
xvi. 7, 8 ..... 488, 549, 551, 568
xvi. 7, 8, 13, 14 549
xvi. 11 ..... 75 n., 500
xvi. 13 ..... 15, 579
xvi. 13, 14 552
xvi. 14 ..... 553, 568
xvi. 15 ..... 239, 574 n.
xvi. 27, 28 ..... 195, 242
xvi. 30 ..... 15, 224
xvii. 2 134
xvii. 3 ..... 31, 43, 71
xvii. 5 ..... 72, 104
xvii. 8 15
xvii. 8, 14 169
xvii. 20 16

ST. JOHN.

xvii. 20, 21, 23 ..... p. 627
xvii. 24 ..... 197 n.
xviii. 31 350
xviii. 36 138
xviii. 37 172
xix. 393
xix. 3 ..... 233 n.
xix. 7, 8 351
xix. 12 368
xix. 14 471
xix. 15 362
xix. 17 362
xix. 19 ..... 368 and n.
xix. 21, 22 388
xix. 23, 24, 28 159
xix. 25 ..... 302, 316
xix. 30 378
xix. 31 ..... 392, 471
xix. 39, 40 393
xix. 40 ..... 394 n.
xix. 41 396
xix. 42 470
xx. 1 472
xx. 2, 18, 20, 25 258
xx. 6, 7 ..... 394, 395 n.
xx. 12 454
xx. 15 ..... 259 n.
xx. 17 ..... 52, 246, 482
xx. 19, 26 473
xx. 21 63
xx. 21, 22 588
xx. 23 618
xx. 25 157
xx. 25, 27 ..... 362, 456
xx. 28 ..... 232, 270
xx. 29 ..... 233, 486
xx. 31 ..... 18, 187
xxi. 7 258
xxi. 25 154

ACTS.

i. 2 ..... 226 n.
i. 3 ..... 453, 483
i. 7 76
i. 9 192
i. 9, 10 482
i. 10, 11 ..... 483, 519, 529
i. 11, 22 ..... 226 n.
i. 14 ..... 303 n.
i. 15 ..... 594, 595
i. 21, 22 453
ii. 1 473
ii. 5 161
ii. 19 408
ii. 22 ..... 33 n.
ii. 23 ..... 331, 382 and n.
ii. 24 436
ii. 25, 26, 27, 30, 31 409
ii. 27 405
ii. 29, 30, 31 452
ii. 30 324
ii. 32 458

ACTS.

ii. 34, 35, 36 ..... p. 159, 492
ii. 36 ..... 270, 499
ii. 38 ..... 56, 649
ii. 38, 42, 47 595
ii. 41 ..... 161, 474, 594
ii. 41, 42, 44, 47 599
ii. 44, 45 620
ii. 47 ..... 594, 617
iii. 15 ..... 276, 500
iii. 18 333
iii. 19 647
iii. 21 521
iii. 22 146
iii. 26 ..... 172, 230
iv. 4 161
iv. 12 ..... 131, 265, 617
iv. 24 115
iv. 27, 28 ..... 331, 451
iv. 32 595
iv. 33 453
v. 3, 4 562
v. 6 399
v. 9 563
v. 14 ..... 161, 595
v. 30 ..... 373 n., 382 and n.
v. 31 ..... 134, 138, 652
v. 32 554
vi. 1, 7 183
vi. 11, 13 ..... 136 n.
vii. 5 262
vii. 18, 19 234
vii. 19 ..... 460 n.
vii. 35 135
vii. 38 ..... 17, 596
vii. 45 124
vii. 48 ..... 236 n.
vii. 55, 56 495
viii. 1 598
viii. 2 ..... 161, 399
viii. 5, 35 225
viii. 12, 16 56
viii. 26 ..... 234 n.
viii. 32 385
viii. 36, 37 ..... 20, 55
ix. 1, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 31, 42 258
ix. 2 ..... 183 n.
ix. 14, 20, 21 606
ix. 20 225
ix. 31 ..... 160, 597
ix. 37 399
x. 19, 20 ..... 549, 550
x. 22 ..... 622 n.
x. 36 ..... 234, 274
x. 38 175
x. 39 ..... 373 n.
x. 40, 41 ..... 454, 466
x. 42 ..... 532, 675
x. 48 56
xi. 16, 24 258
xi. 20 225
xi. 22 598

ACTS.

xi. 26 .... p. 184, 596
xii. 1 .... 183 n.
xii. 12 303
xiii. 1 598
xiii. 2 .... 549, 550
xiii. 6 123
xiii. 23 128
xiii. 32, 33 .. 57, 189, 476
xiii. 38, 39 .... 647, 652
xiii. 39 136
xiii. 44 16
xiii. 47, &c. 258
xiii. 52 588
xiv. 21 .... 183 n.
xv. 3 598
xv. 9 624
xv. 21 .... 136 n.
xvi. 5 597
xvi. 14 579
xvi. 16 .... 259 n.
xvi. 31 226
xvii. 2, 3 .... 180, 326
xvii. 3, 18 225
xvii. 18 656
xvii. 24 .... 77, 86
xvii. 25, 28 82
xvii. 27, 28 39
xvii. 28 .... 46, 657
xvii. 31 .... 523, 526, 529, 669, 670, 680
xvii. 32 656
xviii. 5, 28 180
xviii. 22 598
xix. 2 545
xix. 4 226
xix. 5 56
xix. 9 .... 183 n.
xix. 13 .... 140, 225
xix. 23 .... 184 n.
xix. 32, 39, 41 596
xx. 7 474
xx. 17 598
xx. 28 .... 228, 254, 334, 585, 646
xxi. 20 161
xxi. 21 .... 136 n.
xxii. 16 649
xxiii. 6 667
xxiii. 8 545
xxiv. 14, 15 677
xxiv. 15, 16 681
xxiv. 20, 21 667
xxiv. 22 .... 184 n.
xxiv. 25 523
xxv. 9 .... 345 n.
xxvi. 18 632
xxvi. 22, 23 332

ROMANS.

i. 1, 4 .... 215 n., 476
i. 3 .... 236 n., 284, 324,
i. 3, 4 .... 335, 461

ROMANS.

i. 4 .... p. 189, 476, 577
i. 16 132
i. 20 .... 32, 44, 118
i. 25 .... 237 and n.
ii. 5 .... 526, 540
ii. 5, 16 540
ii. 14, 15, 16 522
ii. 15 38
ii. 29 .... 137, 561 n.
iii. 4 8
iii. 20, 21, 22 136
iii. 24, 25 .... 230, 642
iv. 3 .... 27 n.
iv. 12, 16 441
iv. 15 636
iv. 17 94
iv. 20, 21 516
iv. 24, 25 .... 476, 642
v. 5 583
v. 8 .. 140, 256, 386, 644
v. 8, 9 133
v. 10 .... 133, 386, 477, 643, 644
v. 12 535
v. 14, 17 500
v. 21 500
vi. 3 378
vi. 4 .... 398, 478
vi. 5 478
vi. 5, 6 373
vi. 6, 13, 19 276
vi. 9 691
vi. 12 500
vi. 16 275
vi. 23 695
vii. 6 .... 561 n.
viii. 3 .. 72, 217, 299, 477
viii. 3, 32 .... 251 n.
viii. 9 .... 571, 587, 628
viii. 11 .... 477, 670, 671, 674
viii. 14, 15, 16 583
viii. 14 580
viii. 15 .... 50, 627
viii. 17 .... 48, 53, 583
viii. 18 697
viii. 26 548
viii. 26, 27 580
viii. 27 551
viii. 29 53
viii. 32 .. 54, 246, 256, 387
viii. 33, 34 .... 477, 506
viii. 34 .... 171, 495, 580
ix. 5 .... 30, 237, 292
ix. 21 78
ix. 29 .... 75 n.
ix. 33 264
x. 4 .... 266 n.
x. 8, 9, 10 20
x. 9, 11, 13 267
x. 10 20
x. 12 279

ROMANS.

x. 17 .... p. 20
xi. 14 132
xi. 16 463
xi. 36 .... 79, 118
xii. 2 .... 205 n.
xiii. 1 183
xiv. 6, 7, 8 .. 269 n., 277
xiv. 9 .... 271, 388, 529, 534, 539 n., 669
xiv. 10 .... 531, 678
xiv. 17 588
xv. 8 137
xv. 18, 19 .... 161, 558
xvi. 4, 5 597
xvi. 6 .... 303 and n.
xvi. 16 .... 229 n.
xvi. 25 226
xvi. 26 182

I CORINTHIANS.

i. 1 .... 215 n.
i. 2 .. 229 n., 598, 606, 624
i. 9 627
i. 23 .... 164, 357
i. 30 .... 266 n.
ii. 4 164
ii. 8 .... 260, 276, 334
ii. 10, 11, 12 .... 549, 578
ii. 11 .... 19, 555
ii. 11, 12 571
iii. 5 .... 562 n.
iii. 11 599
iii. 16 .... 565, 628
iii. 16, 17 587
iv. 5 532
iv. 15 .... 48, 249 and n.
iv. 19 .... 562 n.
v. 5 134
v. 7 .... 322, 378
vi. 2 626
vi. 11 .... 580, 624
vi. 15, 19, 20 674
vi. 17 583
vi. 19 .. 400, 565, 645 n.
vi. 19, 20 . 276, 588, 645 n., 652
vi. 20 .... 182, 254, 566, 645, 674
vii. 10, 12 .... 562 n.
vii. 11 643
vii. 17, 22 .... 269 n.
vii. 23 .... 134, 254, 645 and n., 652
viii. 4 41
viii. 5 .... 30, 223
viii. 5, 6 .... 224, 260
viii. 6 .... 45, 46, 69, 72, 79, 117
ix. 22 132
x. 2, 3, 4, 17 602
x. 3, 4 441
x. 32 .... 229 n.

1 Corinthians.

xi. 16 ....p. 229 n., 597
xi. 18, 22.....596
xi. 22 .....229 n.
xi. 26 379
xi. 27 .....269 n.
xii. 3 587
xii. 4, 5, 6.....64
xii. 11 .....549, 558
xii. 12, 13 583
xii. 28 598
xiii. 4, 5, 6, 7 550
xiii. 12 694
xiv. 23, 34 597
xiv. 33 625
xiv. 34 598
xiv. 37.....269 n.
xv. 3 .....376, 642
xv. 4.....466
xv. 6.....454
xv. 9 .....229 n., 598
xv. 12 668
xv. 20 670
xv. 20, 21, 22 669
xv. 21 284
xv. 21, 22 678
xv. 22 477
xv. 24 .....500, 691
xv. 24, 25, 28 ..272, 503
xv. 25 .....496, 502
xv. 25, 26 ....173, 669
xv. 26 502
xv. 26, 54, 57.....681
xv. 27 ....87, 274, 557
xv. 42, 43, 44.....693
xv. 47 .....194, 260
xv. 49 478
xv. 51, 52 ...536, 537 n.
xv. 52 680
xv. 53 671
xv. 54 502
xv. 58 681
xvi. 1, 19.....597
xvi. 2 474
xvi. 6 .....208 n.
xvi. 7 .....562 n.
xvi. 22.....140

2 Corinthians.

i. 1 .....215 n., 229 n.
i. 3.....72
i. 19.....226
i. 21.....186
i. 21, 22 583
ii. 15 179
iii. 6.....561 n.
iii. 15 .....136 n.
iii. 15, 16, 17 560
iii. 16 .....561 n.
iv. 4.....244
iv. 17, 18.....697
v. 1 695
v. 8 692

2 Corinthians.

v. 10 .. p. 437, 531, 662, 674, 678
v. 17.....204
v. 18 642
v. 19 133
v. 21 .....299, 642
vi. 14, 15.....632
vi. 16 566
vii. 1 .....587, 625
viii. 1 598
viii. 14, 15 621
viii. 19, 23, 24 597
x. 5 277
xi. 4.....226
xi. 8, 28 597
xi. 31 ....54, 237 and n.
xii. 2 89
xii. 13 597
xiii. 4 .....409, 476
xiii. 14..64, 72, 587, 627

Galatians.

i. 1 458
i. 2 598
i. 4 .....231, 642
i. 13.....598
i. 15, 16 226
i. 22.....597
ii. 16 226
ii. 20 25
iii. 6 .....27 n.
iii. 10, 22 371
iii. 13 .....372, 645 n.
iii. 16 .....145, 284
iii. 20 503
iii. 26.....53
iv. 4 .....64, 217, 251 and n., 354, 386
iv. 4, 5, 6 ..53, 251, 568, 645 n.
iv. 6.....571, 583
iv. 6, 7.....627
iv. 7 53
iv. 8 30
iv. 8, 9.....215 n.
v. 5 602
v. 6 204
v. 16, 25 580
v. 24 374
vi. 14 374
vi. 15 204

Ephesians.

i. 1 .....215 n.
i. 3, 4 .....72, 104
i. 5.....50
i. 6, 7 230
i. 7 .....134, 642
i. 9 230
i. 11 .....41, 102
i. 13, 14 .....584, 624
i. 18 49
i. 19, 20 458

Ephesians.

i. 20 .....p. 492
i. 20, 21 183
i. 20, 21, 22 .....172, 272, 498
i. 22.....505, 598
ii. 2 500
ii. 5 478
ii. 5, 6 487
ii. 8 579
ii. 10 ....33 n., 48, 204
ii. 15 373
ii. 16 .....445 n.
ii. 17 132
ii. 18 .....73, 568, 578
ii. 19 488
ii. 19, 20, 21 600
ii. 20 19
iii. 10, 21.....598
iii. 12 542
iii. 15.....49
iii. 20 517
iv. 3, 4.....602, 630
iv. 5.....260, 601, 602
iv. 6 .....30, 45, 72
iv. 8, 9 .....442, 443
iv. 8, 11, 12.....170
iv. 9.....194, 405, 407
iv. 10 484
iv. 12 585
iv. 22, 23, 24 205
iv. 30 548
v. 1 52
v. 2 .....170, 179
v. 11..... 629 and n.
v. 14 478
v. 23, 25, 27, 29, 32..598
v. 25, 26, 27 ...607, 609
v. 26 649
v. 30.....541
vi. 1, 2 50
vi. 11 501
vi. 12.....75 n., 500

Philippians.

i. 18 226
i. 19.....571, 587
i. 23.....461, 692
i. 29.....579
ii. 1 627
ii. 6, 7. .....157, 216
ii. 7, 8 374
ii. 8.....218, 386, 457
ii. 8, 9 388
ii. 8, 9, 10, 11 .....141, 271, 497
iii. 6.....598
iii. 8 140
iii. 10 627
iii. 11 .....684 and n.
iii. 13, 14.....697
iii. 19, 20 .....488, 521
iii. 20, 21 134
iii. 21..478, 501, 676, 693

COLOSSIANS.

i. 1 ..... p. 215 n.
i. 12 632
i. 13, 14 231
i. 14 133
i. 14, 15, 16, 17 203
i. 16 ..... 87, 473
i. 18 .. 179, 189, 477, 670
i. 18, 24 598
i. 19 15
i. 20 ..... 139, 643
i. 20, 21, 22 133
i. 21 386
i. 23 162
i. 24 ..... 229 n.
ii. 9 .... 15, 32 n., 33 n., 154, 224, 459
ii. 10, 19 179
ii. 3, 11 137
ii. 12 398
ii. 12, 13, 14, 15 443
ii. 14 373
ii. 15 .... 275, 388, 443
ii. 19 630
iii. 1, 2, 3 .... 488, 697
iii. 9 ..... 564 n.
iii. 10 205
iii. 22 260
iii. 22, 23, 24 278
iii. 24 48
iv. 1 278
iv. 11 123
iv. 15 597
iv. 16 598

1 THESSALONIANS.

i. 6 588
i. 9 ..... 61, 72
ii. 13 16
ii. 14 ..... 229 n., 598
iii. 8 ..... 693 n.
iii. 12, 13 ..... 562 n.
iii. 13 ..... 588, 622 n.
iv. 3 587
iv. 6 ..... 562 n.
iv. 8 564
iv. 13 681
iv. 15, 16, 17 .. 535, 675
iv. 16 680
v. 19 ..... 215 n.
v. 27 ..... 562 n.

2 THESSALONIANS.

i. 1 598
i. 4 ..... 229 n.
i. 7 ..... 521, 622 n.
i. 8, 9 689
i. 10 16
ii. 1 532
ii. 13 587
ii. 14 276
iii. 1, 5, 16 ..... 562 n.

1 TIMOTHY.

i. 17 78
ii. 1 ..... p. 506 n.
ii. 5 ..... 138, 229, 284
ii. 6 ..... 134, 645 n.
iii. 4 50
iii. 5, 15 ..... 229 n.
iii. 6 501
iii. 16 225
iv. 4 ..... 33 n.
iv. 13 ..... 311 n.
iv. 16 132
v. 22 .... 588, 629 and n.
vi. 13 ... 169, 345 n., 385
vi. 15 77
vi. 16 ..... 31, 334

2 TIMOTHY.

i. 9 606
i. 10 .. 132, 502, 680, 695
i. 12 ..... 15, 516
i. 16, 18 .. 268 n., 562 n.
ii. 5 139
ii. 7 ..... 562 n.
ii. 8 476
ii. 12 503
ii. 13 ..... 9, 512
ii. 17, 18 679
ii. 19 ..... 185, 606
ii. 20 ..... 608 and n.
ii. 26 501
iii. 12 164
iii. 16 579
iv. 1 532

TITUS.

i. 2 602
i. 5 588
ii. 11, 12, 13 541
iii. 4 300
iii. 5 580

PHILEMON.

2 597

HEBREWS.

i. 1, 2 ..... 15, 63
i. 2 .. 53, 201 and n., 579
i. 2, 8, 10, 11, 12 ... 201
i. 3 ..... 15, 244, 494
i. 3, 4, 5 189
i. 5 243
i. 6 ..... 255, 274
i. 9 588
i. 13 492
i. 14 ..... 578, 628
ii. 7, 8 ..... 270, 502
ii. 10 ..... 53, 79, 135
ii. 11 ..... 53, 249, 541
ii. 12 596
ii. 13 53
ii. 14 ... 275, 285, 322, 388, 450, 501
ii. 16, 17 284
ii. 16 ... 141, 206, 237, 321
ii. 17 542
ii. 17, 18 ..... 343, 387

HEBREWS.

iii. 1 ..... p. 63
iii. 3, 6 605
iii. 4 ..... 88, 214
iii. 5, 6 ..... 251 n.
iv. 2 579
iv. 8 124
iv. 13 9
iv. 14 484
iv. 15 ..... 322, 343
v. 1 386
v. 7 341
v. 8 385
v. 8, 9 277
v. 9 ..... 135, 695
vi. 2 525
vi. 6 374
vi. 13 10
vi. 17, 18 9
vi. 18 512
vi. 19 484
vi. 19, 20 487
vii. 1 506
vii. 14 151
vii. 14, 21 170
vii. 16, 24 179
vii. 25 .... 134, 171, 506
vii. 26 ... 299, 322, 484, 642
viii. 1 494
viii. 3 170
viii. 6 385
ix. 1 ..... 480 n.
ix. 7, 11, 12 .... 387, 480
ix. 7, 12, 24 .... 193, 484
ix. 12, 25, 26 230
ix. 13, 14 387
ix. 14 254
ix. 15 ..... 48, 695
ix. 16 ..... 231, 385
ix. 22 .. 229, 377, 386, 641
ix. 22, 23, 26 .. 132, 641
ix. 24 506
ix. 27 .. 524, 535, 669, 685
ix. 28 134
x. 4 ..... 254, 386
x. 5, 10 ..... 170, 218
x. 7 332
x. 8, 9 386
x. 10 229
x. 11, 12 506
x. 12 642
x. 12, 13 ..... 499, 502
x. 19, 20 387
x. 19, 21, 22 182
x. 20 487
x. 22, 23 ..... 23 n.
x. 29 385
x. 37 ..... 520 and n.
xi. 1 486
xi. 3 .. 95, 104, 201 &n., 208
xi. 5 440
xi. 6 30

HEBREWS.

xi. 7 ..... p. 12
xi. 17 248
xi. 17, 19 377
xi. 19 453
xii. 2 .. 165, 374, 385, 496
xii. 3 385
xii. 6 51
xii. 9 ..... 46, 657
xii. 9, 10 51
xii. 14 ... 528, 587, 607
xii. 22, 23, 24 630
xii. 23 ..... 526, 598
xiii. 7, 17 589
xiii. 11, 12 377
xiii. 14 695
xiii. 20 ..... 153, 385

JAMES.

i. 17, 18 ..... 48, 494
ii. 23 ..... 27 n., 626
iv. 12 515
v. 4 ..... 75 n.
v. 11 ..... 269 n.
v. 16 25
v. 19, 20 132

1 PETER.

i. 2 587
i. 3, 4 ..... 48, 477
i. 4 695
i. 11 .. 169, 327, 388, 571
i. 15 ..... 52, 625
i. 18, 19 .. 134, 229, 254, 299, 386, 645, 646 n.
ii. 9 167
ii. 11 488
ii. 21 386
ii. 22 ..... 169, 299
ii. 24 133
ii. 25 153
iii. 6 ..... 259 n.
iii. 15 21
iii. 18 .. 292, 335, 408, 642
iii. 18, 19, 20 199
iii. 19 403
iii. 21 ..... 23 n.
iii. 22 ..... 493, 495
iv. 1 335
iv. 1, 2 386
iv. 5 532
v. 2 589
v. 4 153
v. 6 515
v. 10 695

2 PETER.

i. 4 ..... 626, 633
i. 5, 6, 7, 8 625
i. 11 695
i. 20 14
i. 21 579
ii. 1 ..... 645 and n.

2 PETER.

ii. 4 ..... p. 120, 651
ii. 5 200
iii. 4 ..... 33 n.
iii. 5 208
iii. 11, 12 541

1 JOHN.

i. 1, 3 ..... 16, 210
i. 3 626
i. 5 9
i. 6, 7 632
i. 7 630
i. 8 650
ii. 1, 2 .. 506, 581, 642
ii. 20, 27 ..... 186, 588
ii. 22 180
ii. 27 179
iii. 1 ..... 49, 95, 626
iii. 2 ..... 48, 54, 694
iii. 4 ..... 636 and n.
iii. 5 299
iii. 8 501
iii. 9 ..... 249 and n.
iii. 23 122
iii. 23, 24 ..... 139, 583
iv. 1 ..... 215 n.
iv. 2, 3 285
iv. 9 ..... 251 n.
iv. 9, 10 ..... 256, 642
iv. 10 64
v. 1 .. 48, 180, 249 n., 624
v. 3 141
v. 6, 8 385
v. 7 570
v. 9 ..... 8, 454
v. 10 10
v. 12 693
v. 14 581
v. 20 ..... 234, 246

2 JOHN.

9 627

JUDE.

3 ..... 601, 619
6 ..... 89, 119, 321
14, 15 .. 518, 525, 622 n.
25 76

REVELATION.

i. 4 222
i. 5 173
i. 6 173
i. 7 520
i. 8 ..... 221, 269 n.
i. 10 474
i. 11 598
i. 10, 11, 13, 17, 18 .. 221
i. 18 ..... 669, 680
ii. 8 221
ii. 8, 12, 18 598

REVELATION.

ii. 11 ..... p. 688
iii. 1, 7, 14 598
iii. 14 385
iii. 21 506
iv. 8 .. 74, 75 n., 222, 688
iv. 10, 11 118
iv. 11 ..... 103, 269 n.
v. 5 151
v. 9 ..... 615, 645 n.
v. 12 497
v. 13 ..... 76, 255
vii. 15 688
xi. 8 ..... 561 n.
xi. 15 503
xii. 6 ..... 33 n.
xiii. 8 ..... 376, 648
xiii. 17 ..... 645 n.
xiv. 10 ..... 622 n.
xiv. 11 688
xiv. 12 15
xvii. 14 172
xviii. 4 ..... 629 and n.
xix. 6 74
xix. 13 139
xix. 13, 16 .... 173, 260
xx. 4, 11 531
xx. 6 478
xx. 10 688
xx. 12 531
xx. 13 673
xx. 14, 15 688
xxi. 4 695
xxi. 8 689
xxi. 14 137
xxii. 13 221
xxii. 16 ..... 151, 597

APOCRYPHA.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

xi. 17 ..... 209 n.
xi. 20 97
xi. 25 83
xiii. 5 32
xvii. 3 ..... 341 n.
xviii. 15 ..... 209 n.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

xliii. 26 ..... 209 n.
xlvi. 1 135
xlvi. 5 77
xlviii. 9 ..... 226 n.
xlix. 14 ..... 226 n.

1 MACCABEES.

ii. 58 ..... 226 n.

2 MACCABEES.

iii. 24 77
vii. 28 94
xv. 23, 29 77

INDEX.

A.

Absolution of the Church, heresy to deny it, 650.

Adam, how many generations we are probably removed from him, 111.

Adon or Adonai, meaning of this name of God, 260, 269.

Adoption, what it is, 49. Christ not the Son of God by adoption, 250.

Adoration, due to God, 39.

Aetius, 558 n.

Ainsworth's Literal Translation of the Pentateuch quoted, 415.

Al Koran, it teacheth that God hath no Son, 242.

Almighty, the notion of it, 74, 75 n., 76 n., 77. Three degrees of God's Almighty Power, 76. How some extend the word *Almighty*, 83. A distinction between the first and second *Almighty* in the Creed, 82, 507. Why God the Father only is called Almighty in the Creed, 514. Necessity of believing in God as Almighty, 80, 515.

Alpha and Omega, applied to the Son as well as to the Father, 221.

Ammonius, 101 n.

Anabaptists of Flanders, their heresy, 289.

Angels, the third heaven their proper habitation, 89. Created, *ibid.*

Anointing, the use and design of it, 144. The Anointings under the Law typified that of Christ, 165, 166. The Jews' anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, 174. Christ was anointed with the Holy Ghost, 175. This proved to be a proper and sufficient unction, 177; where see the general reasons for anointing.

Anomeans, 558 n.

Antidicomarianitæ, 311 n.

Apelles, Apellitæ, 484 n.

Ἀπό, peculiar meaning of the preposition, 33 n.

Apollinarius, Apollinarians, 281 n., 286 n., 310 n., 336, 423, 424 and n., 425, 426 and n.

Apostles, nature of their faith, 15. Manner of their teaching, 164.

Arians, 238 and n., 286 n., 336 and n., 558 and n., 587 n.

Aristotle, his maxim, *That out of nothing, nothing can be produced*, refuted, 96.

Ἀρραβών, this word explained, 584 n.

Article, prefixed or not to the word *God*, 225.

Articles, how many in the Creed, 1.

Ascension, that Christ ascended not into heaven till after his resurrection, proved, 191. His ascension typified by the High Priest's entering into the Holy of Holies, 479. Necessity of believing in Christ's ascension, 485. The effects of it, 487.

Assent, what it is, 2. Difference of the manner of assent in different kinds of believers, 11.

St. Augustin, his wish, 18.

Authority of testimony, wherein it consisteth, 5.

B.

Baptism, available for the remission of all sins before it, 649.

Baptism, what faith required at, 55.

ברא, the meaning of this word, 93 n.

Basilides, 331 n., 363 n.

Belief, general notion of it, 2; of the heart, 20.

What it is to believe, 19, 25. To believe in, whence this phrase had its original, and what it implies, 26, 543.

Blessed, an epithet attributed by the Jews to the supreme God—Applied by St. Paul to Christ, 236.

Blessing, how given by the priests, 171.

Body, resurrection of the, 653, 670.

Bonosus, 311 n.

Bosom of Abraham, the meaning of this expression, 442 n.

Brethren of our Lord, 313.

Buddas, 115 n.

Burial, not allowed by the Roman law

to persons crucified, 390. Reasons of our Saviour's burial, with the manner of it, 393, 394. Necessity of believing in the burial of our Saviour, 398. Grounds for decent burial of all Christians, 399.
Burning of bodies, 399.

C.

Caligula, 38.
To call, to be called, the meaning of these expressions in the Scriptures, 95.
Calvin, his explication of Christ's descent into hell, 412 n.
Catechising before Easter very ancient, and the reason of it, 22–24.
Catholic; the general meaning of the word, and the particular sense of it when applied to the Church, 610–614. Wherein its Catholicism consisteth, 615.
Cause, necessity of a first, 34, 41, 100.
Cerdon, 116 n., 286 n., 331 n.
Chaldeans, their forged accounts of time, 105.
Chaldee Paraphrase, 146. See *Word of God*.
Charity, motive to it, 633.
Christ, the signification of that name, 142. The Jews expected Christ, and upon what grounds, 145, 146. The time of his coming ascertained, 147. To what end Christ was anointed, for what offices, and in what manner, 165. That Christ had a real existence in heaven, before he was born of the Virgin, proved, 191. Christ the true God, 234. How Christ is born in us, 300.
Christ, to be a prophet, 168, 385. the Son of David, 323. to be a Priest, 170, 386. to be a King, 172, 387. the Son of God, 187. to be worshipped, 254.
Christians, the origin and import of that name, 183.
Χριστός, the original meaning of this word among the Greeks, 142 n.
Church, derivation of this word, 592. What it is in the language of the New Testament, 594. The author's definition of it, 603. Why called Holy, 606. In what persons this holiness is really inherent, 609. Necessity of believing in the Holy Catholic Church, 617.
Clergy, constantly repeated the Creed to the people, 24.
Clouds, how this word was expounded by the Jews, 520.
Cœna pura, what it was, 470 n.
To communicate with sinners in that which is no sin, is lawful, 629.
Communication of the Divine Essence from the Father to the Son, 238; from the Father and the Son to the Holy Ghost, 572. Difference of the manner in which the Divine Essence is communicated from the Father to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, 252.
Communion of saints with God and angels, 626, 628; with one another, 629; of saints on earth with saints departed, 630. How saints communicate with hypocrites, 628. Necessity of believing the communion of saints, 632.
Conception of Jesus by the Virgin, 293, 317.
Confession of the mouth, 20. Necessity of it, 21. Practice of it useful, *ibid.* Every one obliged to it, 24.
Conscience, twofold, 522. Bears witness to a future judgment, *ibid.*—to the being of a God, 38.
Contradiction, how an action may imply it, 511.
Conversion of natures in Christ not to be maintained, 288.
Covenant, nature of a, 652.
Creation, the oldest Poets and Philosophers taught it, 90. Some in after ages denied it upon weak arguments, 91; which are there set down. Creation defined, 93. Two different modes of creation, 99. Why attributed to the Father, 114, 117. What uses may be drawn from the doctrine of the creation, *ibid.* Two ways by which heretics elude the force of those Scriptures which ascribe the creation to Christ, 202.
Creation, one reason why we call God *Father*, 45.
Creation out of nothing, 93.
Creature, God cannot receive any real benefit from it, 79. How then hath he *made all things for himself?* 114. Every creature is good, *ibid.* A new creature and new creation, what, 205.
Credible, Credibility, what it is, 2–5.
Creed, whence so called, 1. A threefold signification of it, 2. Recited at Baptism, and at the administration of the Lord's Supper, 22–24. We believe what it contains, no otherwise than as we find it in the Scriptures, 406.
Cross, the form of it, 365. The acerbity and ignominy of it, 369.
Crucified, that the Messias was to be,

359,361. Necessity of believing that Christ was crucified, 371. Multitudes of Jews crucified by the Romans, 374.
Crucifixion forbidden by the Christian emperors, 363. The death of slaves only, 369.

D.

David, a type of Christ in being twice anointed, 176. Christ himself so called, 273, 498. Throne of David, how continued for evermore, 498.
David, Christ to be descended from, 323.
Days of Christ's death, how made out to be three, 465.
Dead. The Jews never burned the bodies of their dead, 389. The Romans and Grecians did, 399. Why they left this custom off, *ibid.*
Death, what it is, 379. Opinions of the ancient philosophers concerning it, 379 n. Death of Christ necessary for more ends than one, 385. How Christ destroys the power of death, 502.
Deipara, 318.
Deity, notion of, 30.
Descent into hell. This article not always in the Creed, 402. Understood by some of Christ's burial only, 405. Three scriptures of greatest validity to prove Christ's real descent into hell, 407. Various opinions respecting it, 410, &c. The most received and reasonable notion of it, 420. The end and design of it, with various opinions concerning it, 429, 448.
Devotion, a proper motive to it, 516.
Divinity of Christ proved, 213. The identity of it with that of the Father, 224. He has it, not of himself, but by communication from the Father, 238. Divinity of Christ suffered not, 335, 343. How then can we say that God suffered? answered, 337.
Docetæ, what their heresy was, 286 n., 330 n.
Donatists, their error, 608.
Durandus, his explication of Christ's descent into hell, 411.

E.

Earth the foundation and Heaven the roof of the temple of God, 88.
Eclipses, not to be depended on in chronological calculations, 106.
Egyptians, their forged accounts of time, 105. They said the sun had twice risen in the west, 107.
Ἐκκλησία, the meaning of this word, 589 n.
Elipandus, 250 n.
Elymas the sorcerer, 509 n.
Emmanuel, 128, 231, 232. How that prophecy, *They shall call his name Emmanuel*, was fulfilled in Christ, 128, 232.
Enemies of Christ, 499.
Epiphanes, 286 n.
Eternity of God proved, 34, 88; of hell torments, 688. Origen's error about them, 691.
Eternity of the world considered, 90, 104.
Eternity of matter refuted, 95.
Eudoxius, 558 n.
Eunomius, 287 n., 310 n., 558 n.
Euodius, bishop of Antioch, the author of the name of *Christians*, 184 and n.
Eusebius, 555 n.
Eutyches, Eutychians, 40 n., 289 and n., 290 and n., 291 n., 425 n.
Evident to sense, what is so, 4; to the understanding, what is so, *ibid.*
Expectation of the Messiah, 145.

F.

Faith, the object of it, 3, 10. The act of faith must be applied to the object, according to the nature of it, 604. Human faith, what it is, 7. Divine faith, what it is, 8. How to come to the right notion of faith, 5, 11. Definition of Apostolic faith, 15. Another definition of Christian faith, 19. Faith, i. e. affiance in God, the grounds of it, 515.
Faith, difference between faith and science, 4.
Father, the heathens worshipped God as such, 45. Why God is called so, *ibid.* Necessity of believing in God as our Father, 50, 58. It is a reason for our imitation of God, 51. Why Christ says *your*, but never *our* Father, 55. God is called Father in the Creed, with respect chiefly to Christ, 56. How many ways he is the Father of Christ, 57. *Father* denotes priority, and how, 59, 570. Difference which the ancients made between the person of the Father and that of the Son, 69. Proper notion of the Father, *ibid.* Why in the Creed the creation of the world is peculiarly attributed to the Father, 1, 117. How the Fathers are to be understood when they seem to speak of the Father as the cause of his own existence, 66 n.
Felix, 250 n.

First-born, law concerning the, 312.
Flood, evidence of, 110.
Footstool, how the enemies of Christ, the Jews and the Romans, were made his footstool, 499.
Forgiveness of sins. See *Remission.* A motive to the love of God and Christ, 652. Necessity of believing the forgiveness of sins, 651.

G.

Γενεά, the meaning of this word, 112 n.
Generation, different meanings of, 45; of the Son, 242–246.
Gentiles, rapid conversion of, 161.
Ghost, Holy, why not the Son of God, 252. Why not the Father of Christ, 297. His operation in the incarnation of Christ, 189, 295, 558. His personality proved, 546; and Socinian objections refuted, 549. His Divinity proved, 555. His operations, 567. How he is distinguished from the Father and the Son, *ibid.* Proved to proceed from the Father and the Son, 570. The Greek and Latin churches reconciled about this procession, 573. The occasion of their difference hereabout, which ended in a schism, 574. Holy Ghost, why called *Holy*, 577. His offices, 578. Necessity of believing in the Holy Ghost, 585.
Glaucius, 363 n.
Gnostics, 40 n., 305 n.
God, his Knowledge, Wisdom, Justice, Holiness, 8. How God's Omnipotence consists with his Holiness and Truth, 9. Name of God understood wheresoever belief is expressed, 26. Notion and name of God, 30. His Existence, 31. How known to us, *ibid.* God proved to have no beginning, 34. No nation without its God, 36. All creatures depend on God, 38. A twofold necessity to believe a God, 39. Unity of God proved, 40. Its nature, 41. A twofold necessity to believe this Unity, *ibid.* God considered as the Agent in creation, 100. *God*, taken absolutely, how to be understood, 72; often of Christ, 223. *Gods*, men sometimes so called in the Scriptures, and why, 31, 224. Notion of two Gods, one good, the other evil, confuted, 114.
Goodness of God, infinite, how it consists with it to defer the creation so long as he did, 100. Two distinct notions of goodness, 102.
Gospel, its miraculous success, 161.
Guilt, what it is, 637.

H.

Hades, 415, 426. See *Hell.*
Happiness of God, not to be augmented or diminished by the creatures, 102.
Happiness, eternal, wherein it consists, 694.
Heathen, began every action in the name of God, 26. The most ancient of the heathen believed the world to have been made, 90. Their opinions of the duration of the world, 90, 100.
Heaven and earth, in what latitude taken, 85. Three heavens, and how different in glory, 89, 484. Christ ascended into the highest heaven, 484.
Hebrew language, no single word in it which signifies *the world*, 86.
Hell, how Christ descended into it, 410. Why he could not suffer the pains of it, 412. *Hell*, sometimes put for the grave, 414. What the ancients understood by it, 426. Our church's opinion concerning what Christ did in hell, 442. How Christ destroys the powers of hell, 501.
Helvidius, Helvidiani, 311 n., 315 n.
Heracleon, 116 n., 286 n.
Heretics who taught there were two Gods, one the author of good, the other of evil, 114.
Hermiani, 485 n., 679 n.
Hermogenes, 283 n., 485 n.
Holiness, what it denotes, when applied to persons or things, 624. Motives to holiness, 632.
Holy. See *Ghost, Church, Saints.*
Holy of Holies, was to the Jews an emblem of the highest heavens, 484.
Homoiousians, 558 n.
Hope, the grounds of it, 21, 477, 541, 588.
Humility, a motive to it, 119.

I.

Ἰχθύς, a title given to our Saviour, 187 n.
Idolatry, more prevalent in the world than Atheism, 39. What it is, 255.
Jehovah, a name attributed to Christ, 264.
Jeremiah, a spurious passage attributed to him, 433.
Jesus, a name commonly used by the Jews, 123. The derivation and interpretation of it, 124. Jesus proved to be the Christ, 150, 160, 165, 180.
Jesus, of the house of David, 150, 323; born at Bethlehem, 152; born of a Virgin, 152, 307.

Impossible, what may be so to God, without derogation of power, 511.
Incarnation, doctrine of the, 284, 297, 337.
Inferna, 404, 405.
Infinity of God, 77.
Intercession of Christ for us at God's right hand, 171, 506; of the Holy Ghost, 551.
Jonas, a type of Christ, 462.
Joseph, a type of Christ, dying, rising again, and sitting at the right hand of God, 452, 489.
Joshua, a type of Christ, 135.
Jovinianus, 311 n.
Isaac, a type of Christ, 358, 376.
Isidorus, 286 n.
Judæa, government of, 347.
Judgment of the world, proved from reason and Scripture, 522. Believed by the heathen, 523. In it Christ shall preside as Judge, with the reasons for it, 526. An account of the process in the Day of Judgment, 531. Necessity of believing a future judgment, 539.

K.

Whose Kingdom *shall have no end*, why inserted in the Nicene Creed, 504. Kingdom of Christ, twofold, 270, 505. Kingdom of Christ as man, eternal, and in what respect, 273.
Kingly power of Christ, the benefits of it to us, 173, 499.
Kings anointed by the Jews, 165.
Κύριος, the use of this word among the ancient Greeks, 258 n. The original meaning of it, 262 n.

L.

Law of God, the reason, and extent of it, 636.
Life, what it is, 379. Life everlasting, taken in the Creed for the endless duration of all men, 683; for the endless duration of the wicked, 684. Eternal life, the full importance of it, 692.
Life, to live, taken for happiness, and to be happy, by the ancients, 693 n.
Life, in God originally, in man derivatively, 60, 61.
Light, Christ so called from the perspicuity of his doctrine, 153.
Limbus Patrum, whether Christ delivered souls out of that place, 441.
Lord, determinately used for Christ in the New Testament, 258; but sometimes used for men both in the Old and New Testament, 259. How the Greek and Hebrew words for *Lord* correspond, 260. That Christ is Lord, as that word is the interpretation of the name Jehovah, proved, 264. *Lord* applied to Christ as the interpretation of the name *Adon*, or *Adonai*, 270. How and in what respect Christ is Lord, *ibid.* How many ways he hath a right to be our Lord, 274. Necessity of believing in Christ as Lord, 276. Lord of Sabaoth, or of Hosts, meaning of this title, 75, 81.
Lord's day, 474.
Lucanus, 286 n.
Λύτρον, the meaning of this word, 641 n.

M.

Macedonius, Macedonians, their heresy, 228 n., 558 and n., 559 n.
Mahometans, have corrupted a passage in the Psalms relating to Christ, 242. Keep their Sabbath on Friday, the sixth day of the week, and why, 476.
Manes, an account of him, 114 n. The word *Manes* signifies a heretic in the Syriac, 115 n.
Manicheans, 114 n., 240 n., 286 n., 305 n., 331 n.
Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, 504 n.
Marcion, 115 n., 285 n., 286 n., 328 n.
Marcus, Marcosians, 286 n., 331 n.
Maries, several mentioned in the Gospel, 316.
Mary, various opinions of the ancient Fathers about the meaning of this name, 301 n.
Matter, the opinion of the eternity of it, refuted, 95.
Mediatorship of Christ, when and why it shall cease, 503.
Menander, 286 n.
Messias. See *Christ*. A word of the same signification with *Christ*, 142–145. The Jews make a double Messias, 155, 328; mistaking the scriptures that speak of his coming twice, 518. All the Jews formerly believed that the Messias should be the Son of God, though since Christ they have denied it, 187. That the Messias should suffer, proved from prophecies, 156, 327; suffer death, 377; rise again, 452; ascend into heaven, 479; come a second time, 518.
Ministry, what sanctification necessary for the work of it, 585, 588.
Miracles of Jesus, 153, 169.
Miracles, the use of them, 15, 515. They prove the being of God, 37.
Miraculous conception of Jesus, 152, 188, 293.

Montanus, 581 n.
Moses, credibility of, 17. Upon what grounds Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles received and propagated the faith, 11, 12. How much short Moses came of Christ in his miracles, 153.

N.

Nail, struck through a bond, cancelled it, 373.
Nature of no creature is originally evil, 115. Divine nature indivisible, 240. It suffered not in Christ, 335, 343. Distinction of natures in Christ asserted, 287, 383. Necessity of two natures in one Person of Christ, 292.
Nazarenes, 298 n.
Nestorius, Nestorians, 227 n., 292 and n., 318 n., 334 n., 425 n.
Noetus, 282 n., 284 n., 569 n.
None good but one, explained, 100.
Nothing can be produced out of nothing, how far true, 96.
Novatian heresy, 650 and n.

O.

Obedience due from us to Christ, 276.
Oil, why used in anointing, 174, 178.
Omnipotence, the notion of it explained, 9, 507. See *Almighty*.
Only-begotten, 246.
Ophiani, Ophitæ, 286 n.
Opinion, what it is, 5.
Origen, his erroneous opinion of the eternity of the world, 112. His error about hell torments, 691.
Origenists, their error, 676.

P.

Παντοκράτωρ, meaning of this word, 75 n., 507 n.
Paraclete, explained, 581 and n.
Παρασκευή, the meaning of it, 469 n.
Passion of Christ, why the Jews give a false account of the time of it, 353.
Patience, the proper foundation of it in a Christian, 51.
Patripassians, 282 and n.
Paulus Samosatenus, 527 n.
Pelagians, their heresy, 580 and n. Renewed by the Socinians, *ibid.*
Phantasiastæ, the same with Docetæ, 286 n., 330 n.
Phidias, 34.
Philosophers, what they taught about the existence of the world, 90, 98.
Photinus, Photinians, 212 and n., 504 n.
P. Pilate, a man of a rough, untractable spirit, 352. Necessity of expressing in the Creed that our Saviour suffered under P. Pilate, 352. His testimony to the death of Christ, 354.
Πίστις, this word sometimes taken for the Creed, 23 n.
Plato, his distinction between the name of *God* and of *Gods*, 40.
Power, the object, nature, and extent of God's power, 76, 101, 509. On what accounts the belief of it is necessary, 80. Christ had not all power till after his resurrection, 271.
Praxeas, 282 n., 283 n., 569 n.
Pre-existence of Christ, 191, 195.
Preparation, day of, 469.
Priests anointed by the Jews, 166.
Priests, why under the Law they blessed the people at the morning, but not at the evening sacrifice, 171.
Priority of the Father before the Son, 59. Terms of priority given him by the ancients, 63.
Priscillianus, 283 n.
Probable, what is so, 5.
Procession, how it differs from generation, 252.
Procurator, the nature of his office, and the extraordinary power of the Procurator of Judæa, 349.
Πρόδρομος, its several meanings, 487 n.
Properties, communication of, in the Person of Christ, 337.
Prophecies of the Messias fulfilled in Jesus, 150.
Prophecy, a proof of a Divine Being, 37.
Prophets, nature of their testimony, 14.

Q.

Quick, what is meant by that word in the Creed, 534. The quick, i. e. those that are alive in the day of Judgment, shall not be dissolved by death, 535.

R.

Rationalis summarum, 611 n.
Reconciliation between God and man, 643. To be *reconciled to God*, the meaning of this phrase, *ibid.*
Redemption, can only be effected by the Son of God, 254.
Redemption implies both conquest and purchase, 275. How purchased, 343, 641, 645. Redemption one reason why we call God Father, Regeneration another, Resurrection a third, 47, 48.

Regeneration, effected by God as our Father, 48. Applied to the Resurrection, *ibid.* Not applied to Christ, 250.
Regeneration, the work of the Holy Ghost, 580, 583.
Remission of sins explained, 639. How propounded and conferred in the Church, 647, 649.
Repentance, a motive to it, 540. The necessity of it, 649.
Resurrection, a kind of regeneration, 48.
Resurrection of Christ predicted, 452, 462.
Resurrection, the definition of it, 452. Nothing less than Omnipotence can effect it, 457. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, raised Christ from the dead, 458. Distance between the death and resurrection of Christ, how necessary, 463. Necessity of believing the resurrection of Christ, 476. The possibility of our resurrection, 656. The probability of it upon natural and moral grounds, 660. The certainty of it upon Christian principles demonstrated, 666. Identity of the body necessarily supposed, 670. Latitude of the resurrection, 676. Necessity of believing the resurrection, 680.
Revelation of two kinds, mediate and immediate, 11.
Right hand of God, what it signifies, 493.
Roman Governor, had the power of life and death in Judæa sixty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, 351.
Ruffinus, his explication of Christ's descent into hell, 416 n.

S.

Sabbath, reasons for changing it from the seventh to the first day, 473.
Sabellian heresy, 282 n., 569 and n.
Sacrifices, typical of the great atonement, 648.
Saints, who they are, and how a man may become one, 623.
Sanctification, the work of the Holy Ghost, 582.
Σάρος, this term explained, 106 n.
Saturninus, 286 n., 330 n.
Saviour, an appellation given to the heathen gods and men, 128. Reasons at large why Christ is peculiarly called so, 131.
Science, difference between science and faith, 4.
Scriptures, why written, 17.
Scythianus, the first author of the Manichean heresy, 115 n.
Second coming of Christ, 518.
Second death, 688.
Secundus, 286 n.
Seleuciani, 485 n., 679 n.
Sent, never applied to the Father, 63.
Shaddai, the notion and importance of that word, 75, 81.
Sheaf, Waved, a type of Christ rising from the dead, 463.
Shiloh, 147.
Simon Magus, 285 and n., 330 n.
Sin, what it is, 636. The obligation of sin, what it is, 637. Sin and Satan, how Christ destroys their power, 500.
Sitting at the right hand of God explained, 493. The notion of sitting in the Creed, 494. Necessity of believing in Christ sitting at the right hand of God, 505.
Socinians, 197 n., 247 n., 265 n., 289 n., 297, 459, 460 n., 549 n., 552, 554, 555 and n., 560, 644, 649, 673 n., 676, 690.
Socinus, 33 n.
Congruity of the *Son's* mission argued from the preeminence of the Father, 63. *Only-begotten Son*, interpreted by ancient heretics, begotten of the Father only: by Socinians, most beloved of the Father, 246, 247.
Son of God, the world created by the, 201.
Son of Man, 271.
Sonship, the several degrees of it, 54. The peculiarity of the Sonship of Christ, 188, 190. Necessity of the belief of it, 253.
Soul of man, hath no innate ideas, 31. Soul, sometimes used to signify the dead body, 414. Human soul of Christ, with the affections and passions, 288. It descended to the mansions of departed souls, 422.
Spirit, see Ghost.
Sufferings of Christ, how ancient prophecies were fulfilled in them, 156. That the Messias was to suffer, proved, 326. The measure and manner of the sufferings of Christ were pre-determined between the Father and him, 331. Description of the sufferings of Christ, 339. Necessity of believing that our Saviour suffered, 343. Why Christ could not suffer the pains of hell, 412. He suffered in the human nature only, 335.

T.

Tabernacle, the Jews believed that it signified this world, 480.

Temple of Jerusalem, the inferiority of the second to the first, 149.
Terebinthus, 115 n.
Tessaresdecatitæ, 355 n.
Testimony, two sorts of it, and what makes it valid, 6. Testimony of God, the nature of it, 11.
Third day, meaning of, 465.
Transubstantiation, the primitive Church ignorant of this doctrine, 290.
Trinity, the order of it may not be inverted, 65, 570. Difference between the Persons in it, 69, 567.
Trust in God, the grounds of it, 516.
Types of the sufferings of Christ, 332, 357.

U.

Union of the two natures of Christ not dissolved by death, 383. Union of Christ with the Church by the Holy Ghost, 582, 627.
Unity in the Godhead, the ground of it, 40, 71, 241; of the Church, wherein it consists, 599.
Universe, the notion and extent of it, 85, 91. Divided by the Jews into three worlds, 87. Philosophers thought it infinite, eternal, God himself, 90. The Philosophers probably learned the doctrine of the eternity of the universe from the Christians, 101 n.

V.

Valentinus, Valentinians, 286 n., 330 n.
Virgin: two prophecies that Christ should be born of a Virgin cleared, 306. Proofs that Mary was a virgin when she conceived, when she brought forth, and ever after, and objections answered, 308–317. The Virgin styled *Deipara*, and the *Mother of God*, 318. What honour is due to her, 321. Necessity of believing that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, *ibid.*

W.

Way, The: Christianity so called in the Scriptures, 183 n.
Will of God absolutely free, 41, 101. God created by willing the creation, 103. Seat of the two wills in Christ, 286.
Word of God: the Chaldee Paraphrase constantly teaches that the Word of God is the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made, 208 and n. The Word was with God, how, 211. The Word was God, 214.
World. See *Universe*. The manner how the world was made, 93. See *Creation*. No instant assignable before which God could not have made the world, 104. Arguments to prove that the world is no older than the Scriptures represent it to be, 104–113.
Worship to be paid to Christ, 254.

Z.

Zaranes, 115 n.

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED

(WITH THE EDITIONS TO WHICH SPECIAL REFERENCE IS MADE)

IN THE NOTES.

A.

IS. ABARBANEL, seu Abravanel, 29, 151, 174, 177, 179.
Lib. Abchath Rochel, 481.
Aben Ezra, 93, 328, 490, 491, 519.
Abydenus, (ap. Syncell. 38 b.) 106.
Acacius Episc. Cæsar. (ap. Hieron.) 538.
Acta S. Tarachi, &c. 355.
Adrianus, (Isagoge : ap. Crit. Sacr. t. 8.) 311.
Ælianus, 129.
Æschines, 583.
Æschylus, 75, 143, 200, 262, 340, 405, 656.
Scholiastes in Æschylum, 143, 262, 340.
Agatho, (ap. Arist. Eth. Eud.) 511.
R. Joseph Albo, 40.
Alcuinus, (Par. 1617.) 280, 475.
Alexander Alexandrinus, (ap. Theodoret.) 29, 59, 60, 238, 319, 591.
Alexander Aphrodisæus, 466, 467.
Alexander Polyhistor, (ap. Euseb. Chron.) 106.
Alexis, (ap. Athenæum.) 129.
Alexius Patr. Constant. 612.
Alfirozabadius, 243.
Leo Allatius, 320.
R. Moses Alshech, 155.
S. Ambrosius, (Bened., Par. 1686–90.) 8, 22, 62, 68, 137, 138, 175, 241, 251, 253, 302, 309, 311, 314, 337, 357, 397, 407, 408, 423, 429, 432, 444, 445, 447, 474, 493, 512, 556, 572, 601, 636, 648, 662.
Ambrosiaster, 251.
Ammon, 319.
Ammonius, 259, 351, 593.
Amphilochius, junior, (Par. 1644.) 314.
Anastasius Bibliothecarius, (Hist. Byz. Ven. 1729) 575.
Anastasius Sinaita, (ap. Euthym.) 423.
Andreas Cæsariensis, 419, 689.
Andreas Cretensis, (Par. 1644.) 128, 449.
Anianus, 106.
Anselmus, (Par. 1675.) 93.
Joannes Antiochenus, Chronographia, Oxon. 1691.) 184, 428.
Antiochus, 319.
Antiphon, 364, 639.
Antoninus Aug., 350, 576.
Apollinarius, 538, 614.
Apollonius Alexandrinus, 233, 366.
Apollonius Rhodius, 109.
Appianus, 130, 370.
Apuleius, 362, 369, 370, 391.
Aquila, 81, 103, 261, 341, 361.
Th. Aquinas, (Antv. 1612.) 58, 64, 66, 296, 632.
Aristophanes, 128, 258, 341, 395, 396, 593.
Scholiastes in Aristophanem, 129, 143, 177, 258, 395, 396, 593.
Aristoteles, (Bekk. Oxon. 1837.) 5, 6, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42, 52, 90, 95, 96, 97, 98, 107, 109, 244, 276, 277, 379, 380, 467, 511, 584, 639.
Arnobius, (Lugd. Bat. 1651.) 7, 131.
Arnoldus Carnotensis, (ap. S. Cyprian. App.) 359, 447.
Arrianus, 372.
Artemidorus, 112, 113, 129, 358, 391.
Asconius Pedianus, 348.
Asterius, 215.
S. Athanasius, (Bened., Par. 1698.) 55, 58, 59, 64, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 214, 215, 236, 242, 245, 286, 310, 319, 335, 336, 407, 408, 424, 447, 450, 465, 466, 613.
Athenæus, 129, 144, 156.
Athenagoras, (ap. S. Just. Mart.) 105, 657, 661.
Audax, (ap. S. Aug.) 365.
S. Augustinus, (Bened., Par. 1679–1700.) 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 27, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 75, 79, 82, 83, 84, 105, 114, 130, 131, 135, 136, 144, 165, 166, 170, 186, 187, 188, 227, 236, 239, 240, 244, 250, 251, 252, 280, 281, 283, 285, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300, 305, 309, 311, 315, 316, 322, 323, 325, 330, 331, 351, 352, 353, 357, 363, 365, 366, 369, 373, 374, 383, 384,

395, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 409, 410, 415, 423, 424, 426, 428, 431, 432, 436, 437, 439, 442, 444, 449, 450, 451, 456, 457, 458, 461, 464, 468, 469, 470, 471, 475, 479, 484, 485, 486, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 505, 506, 507, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 528, 529, 531, 534, 537, 539, 557, 559, 564, 569, 572, 580, 582, 590, 591, 592, 594, 596, 605, 608, 609, 610, 613, 614, 616, 617, 620, 629, 630, 631, 632, 635, 636, 638, 650, 659, 679, 683, 692, 693, 694, 697.
Ausonius, 373.
Alcimus Avitus, (Galland. Bibl. Patr. X.) 587.

B.

Balsamon, (Jus Græcorum. Leunclav. Francof. 1596.) 612.
S. Barnabas, (Cotelerius, Patres Apostolici, Amst. 1724.) 138, 200, 206, 356, 359, 471, 532, 634.
Baronius, 364.
S. Basilius, Episc. Cæsar. (Bened., Par. 1721–30.) 2, 28, 55, 59, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 103, 183, 185, 188, 238, 244, 247, 248, 253, 309, 311, 312, 319, 402, 468, 504, 558, 559, 562, 594.
Basilius, Episc. Seleuc. 395.
Beatus, 84, 188.
Ven. Beda, (ed. Basil.) 438.
Bellarminus, (Col. Agr. 1617.) 632.
Bereshith Katon, 358.
Bereshith Rabba, 93, 155, 306, 327, 358, 360, 470, 481, 518, 519, 677.
Bernardus, Abbas Clarevallensis, (Par. 1586.) 123, 302.
Berosus, 106.
Beza, 183, 184, 230, 236.

C.

Caius, 49.
Callimachus, 109.
Callisthenes, 107.
Calvinus, 412.
Capitolinus, 370.
Capreolus Episc. Carthag. (Galland. IX.) 246, 425, 432, 436.
Carolus Magnus, Imp., 280, 325, 634, 683.
Cassianus, 325, 334, 402.
Cassiodorus, (Rothom. 1679.) 175.
Catechismus Racoviensis, (Racov. 1651.) 197, 226, 230, 234, 247, 265, 460, 550, 554, 555, 644.
Catena Patrum, (Antv. 1683.) 485.
Catullus, 693.
Cedrenus, Georgius, 242.
Cerularius, Michael, 576.
Charisius, 346.
Charon, 109.
R. Chasdai, 40.
Chronicon Alexandrinum, 354.
Petrus Chrysologus, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. Col. Agr. 1618.) 10, 20, 57, 84, 188, 280, 296, 297, 302, 325, 402, 479, 543, 591, 592, 683.
S. Chrysostomus, (Bened., Par. 1718–38.) 53, 59, 68, 69, 104, 157, 185, 227, 236, 291, 311, 314, 351, 354, 403, 428, 444, 460, 470, 476, 483, 487, 490, 491, 495, 505, 506, 527, 530, 534, 535, 536, 538, 545, 558, 581, 584, 590, 591, 597, 618, 639, 650, 671, 682, 684.
Cicero, 2, 6, 33, 97, 107, 111, 130, 131, 277, 362, 369, 370, 391, 496.
S. Clemens Alexandrinus, (Potter, Oxon. 1715.) 2, 3, 76, 103, 113, 156, 235, 287, 317, 325, 330, 335, 357, 400, 408, 422, 427, 432, 434, 600, 601, 614.
S. Clemens Romanus, (Cotel. Patres Apostolici,) 125, 402, 598, 665.
Clementinæ Constitutiones, 402, 475.
Lib. de Singularitate Clericorum, (ap. S. Cyprian. App.) 321.
Clitophon, 109.
Codinus, 612.
Concilium vel Synodus (Mansi, Concilia. Flor. 1763.) Agath. 23.
——— Alexandr. 559.
——— Antioch. 214, 236, 402, 585, 613.
——— Aquil. 214, 284.
——— Aquisgran. 575.
——— Arausican. 579.
——— Arimin. 403, 405, 613.
——— Bracar. 24.
——— Chalcedon. 23, 281, 289, 310, 402.
——— Constant. 23, 214, 281, 318, 325, 402, 504, 559, 575, 599.
——— Ephes. 227, 319, 320, 402, 575.
——— Florent 67, 576.
——— Francof. 250, 251, 280.
——— Hierosol. 23.
——— Laodic. 23, 24, 475.
——— Mogunt. 24.
——— Nic. 68, 213, 238, 240, 281, 296, 325, 402, 504, 517, 543, 544, 585, 634.
——— Rom. 213, 559.
——— Sard. 59, 214, 402.
——— Seleuc. 402.
——— Sirm. 64, 66, 68, 72, 213, 405, 417.
——— Toletan. 23, 68, 250, 403.
——— Trull. 24.
——— Tyr. 23.
Constitutiones Apostolicæ, 74.
Cornutus, 129.
Crellius, 260, 265, 268, 563, 565, 686.

Crito, 109.
Ctesias, 364.
Q. Curtius, 362, 372.
S. Cyprianus, (Bened., Par. 1726.) 22, 39, 42, 105, 131, 216, 219, 235, 282, 348, 474, 590, 591, 592, 594, 600, 602, 603, 641.
S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, (Aubert., Par. 1638.) 57, 59, 64, 66, 68, 115, 157, 227, 248, 292, 314, 319, 320, 325, 351, 408, 423, 432, 573, 574, 603.
S. Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, (Bened., Par. 1720.) 7, 19, 29, 53, 66, 68, 72, 76, 85, 123, 137, 142, 250, 285, 325, 402, 429, 504, 526, 591, 593, 599, 613, 616, 617, 620, 635, 639.

D.

Damascenus Monachus (Lequien., Par. 1712.) 67, 242, 248, 302, 305, 330, 366.
Damasus Papa, (Galland. vi.) 213, 402.
Pet. Damianus, (Bassani, 1783.) 176.
Demosthenes, 583.
Dercyllus, 109.
Fl. Lucius Dexter, 348.
Didymus Alexandrinus, (ap. S. Hieron.) 215, 390, 537, 538, 574.
Dinarchus, 200.
Diodorus Siculus, 105, 106, 263, 372.
Diogenes Laertius, 33, 105, 116, 129, 346, 389, 646.
Diomedes (ap. Grammat. Lat. Auct., ed. Putsch., Hanov. 1605.) 346.
Dion Cassius, 348, 350, 364, 368, 612, 693.
Dion Chrysostomus, (ed. Reiske, 1778.) 143.
Dionysius, 109, 346.
Dionysius Alexandrinus, (Rom. 1796.) 219, 319, 320, 610, 612.
Dionysius Areopagita, (Par. 1615.) 401, 507, 509, 512.
Dionysius Halicarnassæus, 275.
Diphilus, 427.
Durandus, 19, 27, 64, 411.

E.

Ebno'l Athir, 243.
Ecbertus, (Galland. xiv.) 447.
Echa Rabati, 265.
Elipandus, (Mansi, Conc.) 250, 404.
Ennius, 45, 131.
Ephraimus Patr. Theopolis, (in Photii Bibl.) 291, 320, 321.
Epicharmus, 513.
Epicurus, 108.
S. Epiphanius, (Valesii, Colon. 1682.) 51, 53, 57, 59, 64, 71, 85, 114, 115, 178, 184, 212, 213, 214, 236, 240, 261, 282, 283, 302, 304, 305, 311, 312, 314, 321, 331, 355, 363, 402, 408, 484, 505, 536, 544, 545, 557, 559, 569, 570, 573, 574, 591, 592, 599, 613, 635, 651, 662, 672.
Epiphanius Monachus, 315.
Episcopius, 288.
Erasmus, 183, 236.
Etherius Uxamensis, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. Col. Agr. 1618–22, vol. viii.) 84, 188, 280, 325, 403, 479, 543, 683.
Etymologus, 259, 340, 341, 364, 394, 395, 405, 584, 644, 645.
Euclides, 220.
Eugenius, Episc. Romæ, 67.
Euodius, 431.
Euripides, 128, 143, 156, 263, 419.
Scholiastes in Euripidem, 263, 466.
Eusebius Gallicanus, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. vol. v.) 20, 84, 281, 325, 450, 479, 543, 632, 683.
Eusebius Pamphili, (Præp. Evang. Demonstr. Evang. &c., Par. 1628; Hist. Eccl. ed. Reading. Cantab. 1720.) 7, 23, 29, 40, 65, 69, 71, 85, 106, 115, 124, 125, 126, 127, 143, 144, 166, 167, 184, 185, 235, 241, 245, 263, 313, 316, 319, 325, 336, 348, 353, 354, 355, 366, 368, 429, 474, 504, 524, 557, 582, 584, 596, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614.
Eustathius, Archiep. Antioch. (Lugd. 1629.) 315.
Eustathius, Archiep. Thessalonicensis, 47, 75, 143, 144, 177, 259, 311, 340, 341, 364, 395, 418, 419, 644, 645.
Euthymius Zigabenus, 314, 423, 424, 442, 527, 576.
Eutychius, Patr. Alexandriæ, 347.
Evagrius, 310, 319.

F.

Facundus, (Galland. xi.) 214, 287, 318, 426.
Faustinus Presbyter, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. vol. iv.) 57.
Faustus Rhegiensis, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. vol. v.) 66, 585.
Felix, 250.
S. Pompeius Festus, 131, 348.
Franciscus Davidis, 232.
Franciscus Ferrariensis, 11.
Franciscus de Oviedo, 10.
Fulgentius Afer, (Par. 1684.) 63, 72, 212, 213, 252, 280, 423, 425, 445, 449, 510, 516, 572, 573, 608.

G.

Galenus, (Hippocratis et Galeni Opera, Par. 1679.) 467, 514.
Gaudentius Brixianus, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr. vol. iv.) 423.

Gelasius, Episc. Rom. (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr., vol. v.) 290, 402, 449.
Aulus Gellius, 2, 49, 380, 381, 584.
Gennadius Massiliensis, (Eccl. Dogm. ap. S. Aug. vol. viii. App.; Catal. Illustr. Vir. ap. S. Hieron. vol. ii.) 57, 66, 99, 252, 330, 424, 534, 535, 537, 579, 585, 672, 683.
Germanus, Patr. Constant., (Galland. xiii.) 175, 690.
Jac. Goar, 106.
Gotofredus, 310.
Gregorius Magnus, (Par. 1715.) 4, 437, 438, 456, 495, 687.
S. Gregorius Nazianzenus, (Bened., Par. 1778–1840.) 58, 59, 66, 69, 72, 73, 171, 175, 213, 239, 240, 248, 311, 317, 319, 401, 439, 484, 485, 544, 546, 547, 573, 613.
S. Gregorius Nyssenus, (Par. 1638.) 29, 83, 301, 305, 336, 337, 366, 384, 385, 430, 453, 559.
Gregorius Turonensis, 367.
Grotius, (Amst. 1679.) 219, 227, 236, 436, 621.

H.

R. Moses Haddarshan, 481, 492, 519.
Harpocration, 129, 583.
Hegesippus, 316.
Hellanicus, 109.
Helvidius, 315.
Hermas, (Cotel. Patr. Apost.) 40, 75, 408, 434, 591.
Herodianus, 364, 370.
Herodotus, 105, 107, 113, 129, 371, 391, 394.
Hesiodus, 90, 405.
Hesychius Alexandrinus, 26, 69, 75, 76, 106, 112, 113, 125, 129, 135, 144, 262, 263, 340, 341, 348, 359, 364, 368, 380, 394, 487, 584, 622, 638, 640, 645.
Hesychius Illustrius, 221.
Hierocles Alexandrinus (ed. Needham, Cantab. 1709,) 66, 79, 86, 96, 97, 100, 101.
S. Hieronymus, (Vallarsii, Veronæ, 1734–42.) 19, 22, 69, 93, 94, 101, 114, 123, 124, 127, 136, 138, 157, 175, 176, 200, 209, 212, 214, 215, 241, 261, 262, 263, 287, 300, 302, 304, 307, 310, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 321, 347, 348, 354, 357, 362, 365, 397, 401, 407, 427, 428, 429, 447, 449, 469, 474, 476, 496, 536, 537, 538, 554, 584, 585, 590, 592, 601, 603, 608, 610, 625, 650, 654, 666, 671, 672, 675, 676, 682.
S. Hilarius, (Bened., Par. 1693.) 31, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 131, 212, 213, 214, 236, 238, 240, 241, 250, 298, 314, 317, 336, 407, 430, 444, 445, 449, 471, 503, 572, 573, 581, 613.
R. Hillel, 308.
Hincmarus, (Sirmondi, Par. 1645.) 227, 228.
Hippocrates, (Par. 1679.) 380.
Hippolytus, 236, 320, 408.
Hippys, 109.
Hirtius, 370.
Homerus, 45, 75, 80, 81, 90, 113, 129, 177, 219, 311, 340, 341, 364, 400, 405, 418, 513, 645.
Scholiastes in Homerum, 177.
Horatius, 52, 370, 390.
Hugo Etherianus, 575.
R. Huna, 306.

I.

R. Jacob f. Chajim, 361.
Iamblichus, (ed. Commelin. 1598.) 87, 101, 513, 516.
S. Ignatius, (Cotel. Patr. Apost.) 208, 235, 286, 318, 346, 353, 373, 402, 456, 461, 594, 598, 603, 614.
Lib. Ikkarim, 145, 265.
Innocentius III. Episc. Rom. 367.
Joannes IV. Papa, (Galland. xiii.) 322.
Jobius, (in Photii Bibl.) 314, 432, 512.
R. Johanan, 147.
Jonathan, 147, 415, 416, 525, 622, 689.
R. Joseph, 308.
Josephus, 130, 303, 346, 347, 348, 349, 362, 375, 392, 398, 427, 470, 480.
R. Josuah, 306.
S. Irenæus, (Bened., Par. 1710.) 22, 40, 75, 84, 115, 162, 165, 229, 236, 257, 263, 286, 353, 363, 366, 367, 402, 407, 408, 422, 427, 430, 432, 433, 436, 449, 470, 543, 582, 583, 585, 586, 592, 594, 595, 596, 601, 641, 673, 678, 686.
Isaac, (Galland. vii.) 253.
R. Jo. Isaac Levita, 361.
Isæus, 582.
Isidorus Hispalensis, (Col. Agr. 1617.) 123, 302, 347, 403, 438, 616.
Isidorus Pelusiota, (Par. 1638.) 59, 311, 469, 512, 533, 534, 597, 607.
Lib. Juchasin, 353.
R. Judah, 306.
Julianus Imp., 214, 319, 401.
Justinianus Imp., 275.
S. Justinus Martyr, (Bened., Par. 1742.) 35, 98, 115, 125, 135, 142, 143, 156, 158, 165, 205, 307, 348, 355, 356, 357, 359, 365, 367, 373, 402, 427, 428, 429, 433, 471, 474, 490, 491, 517, 524, 535, 586, 611.
Juvenalis, 369, 390.

Juvencus, 395.
Ivo, 616.

K.

R. Kimchi, 148, 151, 243, 306, 328, 377, 490.
Al Ḳoran, 242.

L.

Lactantius, (Bipont. 1786.) 45, 68, 69, 96, 123, 125, 131, 136, 137, 142, 143, 144, 166, 619, 635.
Leo, Imp. (ap. Combef. Nov. Auct. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat., vol. ii.) 49, 447.
Leo Magnus, (Par., 1675.) 10, 22, 40, 84, 187, 188, 212, 280, 283, 290, 320, 321, 325, 385, 457, 469, 486, 572, 605, 613.
Leontius, 611.
Leporius, (Galland. ix.) 219, 288, 424.
R. Levi Ben Gerson, 166.
Lex Canonica, 23.
Liberatus, (Par. 1675.) 228, 319, 320.
Linus, 90, 513.
Lipmannus, 490.
Livius, 362, 364, 370, 496.
Pet. Lombardus, 27, 575.
Longinus, 103.
Lucianus, 129, 130, 303, 362, 365, 389, 390, 391, 575.
Lucifer, Episc. Calaritanus, (Colet., Ven. 1778.) 212.
Lucilius, 45.
Lucretius, 88, 104, 108, 110.
Lycophron, 51.

M.

Macarius, (Galland. vii.) 402, 447.
Macrobius, 263, 399.
Mæcenas, 367.
R. Mos. Maimonides, 42, 43, 145, 392, 415, 554, 667, 677.
Marcellus, Episc. Ancyr., 84, 325, 504, 517, 543.
Nonius Marcellus, 404.
Marcianus Heracleota, (Hoeschel. Geograph., Aug. Vind. 1600.) 221.
Marm. Arundel, 346.
Martialis, Episc. Lemovicensis, 396.
M. Val. Martialis, 693.
Maximus Taurinensis, (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr. vol. v.) 84, 188, 280, 325, 365, 402, 475, 479, 494, 495, 543, 591, 683.
Pomponius Mela, (Tzschuck, Lips. 1807.) 105, 107, 109, 405.
Menander, 7, 80, 584.
Joh. Mercerus, 361.
Methodius, Episc. Patarensis, (in Photii Bibl.) 97, 101, 112, 539, 592.
Meursius, 318.
Midrash, ויושע, 304.
Midrash Tillim, 264, 265, 306, 390, 492, 519, 520, 665.
Lib. Μικρὰ Λαβύρινθος, 235.
Minucius Felix, (Lugd. Bat. 1672.) 105, 365, 399, 400, 658, 659.
Moschopulus, (ap. Craston. Lex. Ald., Ven. 1524.) 12, 127, 208, 258.
Auctor Vit. Mosis, 302.
Musæus, 90.

N.

Nemesius, (Bibl. Patr., Par. 1624.) 287.
Neratius, 392.
Nestorius, (ap. Cyril. Alex.) 292, 293.
Nicephorus, (Par. 1630.) 314, 319, 368.
Nicetas Colossensis, 576.
Nogarola, 109.
Nonnus, 142, 145, 196, 197, 208, 366, 367, 395, 396.
Novatianus, (ap. Tertull. Opp. App.) 40, 60, 72, 73, 84, 123, 235, 439, 444, 543, 581, 582, 583.

O.

R. Obadias de Bartenora, 397.
Ocellus Lucanus, (ed. Commel. 1595.) 90, 91, 92, 93, 109, 110, 220.
Œcumenius, (Par. 1631.) 314, 444, 538.
Onkelos, 147, 415, 525, 689.
Optatus, (Dupin, Antv. 1702.) 40, 187, 325, 616.
Origen, (Bened., Par. 1733–59.) 7, 8, 9, 28, 70, 71, 74, 75, 84, 101, 110, 112, 146, 147, 156, 157, 187, 203, 207, 209, 236, 250, 261, 263, 264, 305, 310, 313, 315, 320, 327, 337, 365, 375, 397, 399, 400, 402, 407, 408, 423, 427, 428, 444, 512, 513, 538, 539, 597, 598, 610, 611, 635.
Orpheus, 90, 129.
Ovidius, 368, 373.

P.

Georgius Pachymeres, (Hist. Byzant., vol. xiii.) 65.
Pacianus, (Galland. vii.) 444, 610, 613, 616.
Panodorus, 106.
Rob. Parkerus, 412.
Paschasius, (Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr., vol. v.) 544, 584, 620.
S. Paulinus Aquitanus, (Veronæ 1736.) 357, 572.
Jul. Paulus, 359, 369, 393.
Paulus Samosatenus, 280.
Pausanias, 129, 130, 346.
Pelegrinus Laureac. Episc., (Bibl. Vet. Patr., vol. x.) 637.
Pesikta, 327.
Dion. Petavius, (Par. 1624.) 67, 71, 115, 241, 320.
Petronius Arbiter, 362, 391.

Phavorinus, 638.
Pherecrates, 129.
Philastrius, (Galland. vii.) 212, 282, 432, 485.
Philemon, 524.
Philo, (ed. Mangey, Lond. 1742.) 14, 48, 88, 209, 260, 348, 352, 389.
Philochorus, 109.
Joannes Philoponus, (Galland. xii.) 86, 340.
Philostratus Lemnius, (Lips. 1709.) 466.
Phocylides, 379.
Phœbadius, (Galland. v.) 60, 65, 66, 67, 238, 336.
Photius, (Epistolæ, Lond. 1651, Bibliotheca, ed. Bekker. Berol. 1824–5.) 60, 76, 97, 101, 157, 244, 291, 310, 311, 314, 318, 319, 512, 539, 559, 576, 592, 690.
Phrynichus, 259.
Pindarus, 219, 427.
Lib. Pirke Avoth, v. Talmud.
Plato, 33, 40, 87, 90, 100, 105, 110, 111, 129, 346, 379, 381, 427, 524, 668.
Plautus, 358, 362, 369, 370, 584.
Plinius senior, 90, 108, 178, 371, 405, 508, 511, 514, 656, 669.
Plinius junior, 162, 235, 419, 474.
Plutarchus, (Xylandri, Francf. 1620.) 46, 87, 98, 129, 130, 144, 341, 346, 358, 362, 364, 371, 391, 392, 427, 466, 509, 514, 668.
Polemo, 109.
Trebellius Pollio, 371.
Julius Pollux, 258, 368, 396.
Polybius, 130, 371, 373, 639.
S. Polycarpus, (Cotel. Patr. Apost.) 74, 402, 436, 696.
Porphyrius, (Vita Plotini, ap. Plotini opp. ed. Ficin., Basil. 1580.) 101, 107, 200, 263, 356, 612, 666.
Priscianus, 346.
Proclus, (Basil. 1534, Vratislav. 1847.) 100, 101, 105, 106, 178.
Procopius, (Alemanni, Lugd. 1623.) 310.
Prosper, (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr., vol. v.) 48, 453.
Prudentius, 390, 445, 572.
Ptolemæus, 45.

Q.

Quintilianus, 395.

R.

Rabina, 665.
Ruffinus, (Exp. Symboli. ap. S. Cypriani Opp.; Invect. in Hieron. ap. S. Hieron.) 19, 22, 40, 42, 57, 68, 76, 84, 166, 187, 188, 248, 280, 281, 284, 325, 352, 402, 405, 406, 407, 408, 416, 449, 451, 479, 539, 543, 590, 591, 592, 620, 635, 653, 672, 676, 682, 684.

S.

R. Saadias Gaon, 518, 520.
Sallustius, Philosophus, 100, 101, 379.
Salmasius, 125, 364, 396.
Salvianus, (Galland. x.) 23, 185.
Lib. Sanhedrim, v. Talmud.
Scaliger, 106.
Jo. Schlictingius, 192, 247, 543, 586.
Secundus, 379, 380.
Lib. Seder Olam, 303.
Seneca, 37, 362, 367, 372.
Servius, 45, 312, 370, 419, 497, 515, 638.
Severus, (Catena Patrum in Job.) 46.
Sextus Empiricus, (Genev. 1621.) 2, 685.
Jo. Siculus, 242.
Silius Italicus, 391.
R. Simai, 667.
Simplicius, (Aldi, Ven. 1526.) 2, 107.
Smalcius, 298, 686.
Smyrnæ Eccles. Epist. (Cotel. Patr. Apost.) 74, 614, 696.
F. Socinus, (ap. Bibl. Fratrum Polon., 1656.) 33, 192, 202, 219, 229, 233, 265, 266, 268, 549, 550, 552, 553, 555, 644, 649, 690.
Socrates Scholasticus, (Reading, Cantab. 1720.) 23, 29, 55, 64, 66, 85, 114, 115, 212, 213, 214, 238, 240, 241, 319, 320, 402, 403, 405, 417, 426, 504, 559, 587, 591, 612, 613, 615.
Solinus, 405.
R. Solomon Jarchi, 81, 93, 151, 155, 327, 328, 360, 377, 490, 519.
Sophocles, 76, 87, 129, 143, 144, 262, 263, 427.
Scholiastes in Sophoclem, 143, 262.
Sozomen, (Reading, Cantab. 1720.) 29, 55, 212, 213, 214, 363, 368.
Stobæus, 80, 513.
Strabo, (Lips. 1801.) 128, 396.
Suarez, 438, 439, 440.
Suetonius, 142, 346, 349, 368, 369, 391, 395.
Suidas, 69, 76, 112, 115, 129, 144, 157, 184, 205, 221, 258, 310, 341, 368, 405, 467, 584, 612, 638.
Sulpicius Severus, (Veronæ 1754.) 212, 214.
Sylburgius, (Saracenica, ed. Commelin. 1595.) 242.
Symmachus, 81, 103, 261, 341.
Synesius, (Par. 1631.) 69, 423, 470.

T.

Tacitus, 131, 347, 348, 349, 350, 370, 389.

Talmud, 147, 327, 328, 519, 582, 665, 677.
Terentius, 369, 370.
Tertullianus, (Par. 1675.) 22, 29, 30, 31, 36, 40, 43, 44, 51, 65, 68, 75, 84, 87, 96, 115, 117, 123, 125, 130, 131, 136, 142, 157, 162, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 207, 216, 219, 235, 257, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 298, 307, 310, 317, 324, 325, 328, 330, 331, 335, 347, 354, 356, 357, 360, 363, 365, 366, 367, 380, 391, 400, 402, 408, 418, 422, 427, 430, 445, 449, 450, 470, 474, 483, 490, 491, 524, 536, 537, 543, 569, 581, 582, 584, 585, 586, 590, 593, 594, 595, 600, 603, 611, 641, 656, 658, 659, 662, 663, 672, 674, 675, 676, 679, 684, 687, 695.
Thales, 33.
Theocritus, 129, 143.
Scholiastes in Theocritum, 143.
Theodoretus, (Sirmond., Par. 1642 : Hist. Eccl., Reading, Cantab. 1720.) 2, 7, 23, 29, 55, 59, 60, 68, 69, 115, 129, 136, 228, 236, 238, 252, 255, 263, 283, 287, 290, 291, 319, 321, 337, 402, 417, 424, 444, 485, 512, 513, 524, 535, 538, 559, 574, 584, 591, 613, 672, 684.
Theodorus Abucara, (Bibl. Patr., Par. 1624.) 72, 73, 318.
Theodorus Heracleotas, (ap. S. Hieron.) 536, 538.
Theodorus Lector, 24.
Theodorus Mopsuestenus, 232.
Theodorus Studita, 471.
Theodotus, Episc. Ancyranus, 76, 212.
Theodulphus, 573.
Theophanes, 366.
Theophilus Alexandrinus, (Galland. vii.) 471.
Theophilus Antecessor, 49.
Theophilus Antiochenus, (ap. S. Just. Mart. Opp.) 82, 186, 611, 617, 662, 679.
Theophrastus, 487.
Theophylactus, (Comm. in Evang., Par. 1631; Comm. in Pauli Epist., Lond. 1636.) 126, 311, 314, 351, 366, 444, 527, 533, 538, 576, 684.
Thucydides, 201, 346.
Timotheus, Presb. Constant., 116.
Titus Bostrensis, (Bibl. Patr., Par. 1624.) 175.
Tremellius, 227, 581.
Tribonianus, 362.
Trisimachus, 109.
Lib. Tzeror Hammor, 519.

U.

Ulpianus, 49, 348, 350, 393.
Lib. de Universi Natura, 427.

V.

Valerius Maximus, 370, 391.
Varro, 45, 584.
Venantius, Fortunatus (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr., vol. vi.) 84, 280, 404, 450, 479, 543, 591, 635, 683.
Victorinus Afer, (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr. vol. iv.) 60, 67, 283.
Vigilius Tapsensis Afer, (Chifflet., Divione 1664.) 23, 40, 55, 60, 62, 68, 187, 188, 213, 214, 286, 334, 572.
Vincentius Lirinensis, (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr., vol. v.) 212, 213, 331.
Virgilius, 33, 312, 361, 365, 405, 419, 427, 497, 514, 515, 638.
Volkelius, 666.
Vulcatius Gallicanus, 369, 370.

W.

Paulus Warnefridus, (Bibl. Magna Vet. Patr., vol. viii.) 318.

X.

Xanthopulus, 368.
Xenophanes, 109.
Xenophon, 78.

Z.

Zacharias Mitylenæus, (Galland. xi.) 67, 69.
Zenobius, (Antv. 1612.) 51.

ERRATA.

Page 428, *note.*. *For* Anastasius Antiochenus, *read* Anastasius, Antiochenus.

Page 674. *For* 1 Cor. v. 10, *read* 2 Cor. v. 10.